

The
POISONED
LOVING-CUP



CHARLES GRANT MILLER

Hans. G. Kellermann,
2321 W. 21st St. Phone Canal 4156.

Hans G. Kellermann
Chicago
Ill
18.10.28.

Hans. G. Kellerman,
2321 W. 21st St. Phone Canal 4156.



THE POISONED LOVING-CUP

UNITED STATES SCHOOL HISTORIES FALSIFIED
THROUGH PRO-BRITISH PROPAGANDA
IN SWEET NAME OF AMITY

By
CHARLES GRANT MILLER

AUTHOR OF "TREASON TO AMERICAN TRADITION,"
"PROPAGANDA IN SCHOOL HISTORIES," ETC.

NATIONAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY
BANKERS BUILDING, CHICAGO

1928

COPYRIGHT, 1928

NATIONAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY


ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

"Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, I conjure you to believe me, fellow citizens, the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake; since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government."

—Washington.

"Let us re-adopt the Declaration of Independence and with it the practices and policy which harmonize with it."

—Lincoln.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

INTRODUCTION



ANGLO-AMERICAN accord is splendid sentiment. America ever rises gladly to this toast. But we must drink from our own crystal chalice of unsullied truth, and not from a poisoned loving-cup of coalition propaganda!

It will be clearly seen in the following pages how certain American school histories in general use have recently been revised or newly written in a spirit of contemptuous hostility toward heroes of the Revolution and other founders and defenders of our Republic. It will be seen how ten revisionists in their altered texts diversely pervert and distort, jumble and confuse, minimize or omit many of the vital characters, events and ideals hitherto held sacred and essential in American history; but all unite in close conformity to a topical outline designed for promotion of British-American union.

Contest against the treason texts has been waged for seven years, and already has resulted in thousands of school board decisions against them, in statutory enactments excluding them from five states, and in corrections of some of the texts attacked. And yet, American children in most public schools today are taught not the American version of our country's history but British versions.

This is a grave indictment, and the charges are not made loosely. They in every instance are specifically presented, with direct quotations, page references and every aid to either disproof or verification.

The charges herein presented have been indorsed, and the accused text books condemned, in formal resolutions unanimously adopted in their national conventions, by the following-named great American patriotic organizations:

Sons of the American Revolution.

Descendants of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence.

Grand Army of the Republic.

Knights of Columbus.

Veterans of Foreign Wars.

United Spanish War Veterans.

The American Legion.

Daughters of the American Revolution.

Patriotic Order Sons of America.

United States Daughters of 1812.

On the other hand, Carnegie Foundation influences, Rhodes scholarships, English-Speaking Union activities, Oxford degrees, "Interdependence Day" doctrines, London History dinners, and a dozen or more British satrapies in the form of propaganda organizations that have set themselves up in our country have constituted a deadly menace to the educational agencies of the United States.

Patriotic teaching of true American history in the public schools is the stimulus and guide of our national spirit and progress. It must be kept pure and virile. It must no longer be left subject to perversion, distortion and pollution by such school men as owe their promotion and their attitude of mind to the organized influences which seek to undermine the American spirit.

The public schools are sustained by the people for the true enlightenment of our children and the cultivation of sound and loyal citizenship. They are not a proper field for exploitation by foreign propagandists.

No complaint rests against wholesome desire to promote Anglo-American amity. But this worthy desire does not justify the outright vandalism attempted upon our history. Nothing can justify misrepresentation of the causes and conduct of the Revolution, defamation of our nation's founders, perversion of their doctrines and distortion of their ideals to the minds of American children.

The War of the American Revolution stands alone in all history with a distinctive meaning, not only for Americans, but for all the world. It is the outstanding great war of all time which was waged for clean, exalted principles of abstract human rights, unmixed with ambition for dynastic aggrandizement, greed of trade dominion or lust of conquest. The principles and traditions descending to us from that heroic period are a

proud heritage which we already generously have shared with the whole human race.

But to our own children this heritage is now denied.

The heroic history of a nation is the drum-and-fife music to which it marches. It makes a mighty difference whether America continues to quick-step to "Yankee Doodle" or takes to marking time to "God Save the King!"

The true history of the heroisms, sacrifices, principles, ideals, traditions and purposes upon which our Republic was established must stand. We must not let it be destroyed. We show ourselves unworthy of our priceless heritage from the fathers, if we do not preserve it sacredly in trust and transmit it unimpaired to posterity.

Our children, as well as the unassimilated from other lands, must be taught the truth of our Republic's birth and mission, or else our national ideals, spirit, solidarity and morale must shamefully perish.

Our first and most sacred patriotic duty is the restoration of true American history in the public schools.

CHARLES GRANT MILLER.

MARKWOOD ROAD,
FOREST HILLS, LONG ISLAND.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	V
--------------------	---

I.

A LONDON HISTORY DINNER.....	1
SCHOOL HISTORIES REVISED.....	3
UNIFORMITY OF PURPOSE.....	5
THE BRAND OF PARLIAMENT.....	7

II.

THE TREASON TEXTS.....	8
THE FATHERS DEFAMED.....	9
AUTHORS SELF-EXALTED	11
IRRECONCILABLE CONTRADICTIONS	13
NEW CHART AND COMPASS.....	15

III.

OFFICIAL BRITISH PROPAGANDA.....	17
THE WAR-TIME PROPAGANDA.....	19
PURPOSE, PLAN AND RESULT.....	21
RUBUKE EVEN IN ENGLAND.....	23
GUARANTY OF FRIENDSHIP.....	25

IV.

BRITISH HISTORY TRANSPLANTED.....	27
SEEDS OF DISSENSION.....	29
VERY NEAR TO PLAGIARISM.....	31
COMPLAINT AGAINST RENEGADES.....	33
MAKING GEORGE III A GERMAN.....	35
BRITISH HISTORY REVISED.....	37
OUR AUTHORS FOLLOW LEAD.....	39
JUMBLING THE NEW AND OLD.....	41

V.

HISTORY TEACHERS COERCED.....	42
THE TRAINING OF TEACHERS.....	43
A PROTEST IN CLASS-ROOM.....	45

CONTENTS

RESOLUTIONS RAILROADED	47
ANGLICIZED "AMERICANIZATION"	49
MILLION "RESEARCH" FUND	51
A SPECIFIC TEST OF TRUTH	53
SURPASSING HOSTILE VERSIONS	55
TRUE HISTORY AND FALSE	57

VI.

NATION'S FRIENDS DEFAMED	59
INGRATITUDE TO FRANCE	61
GERMANS AND IRISH IGNORED	63
MANY HEROES ELIMINATED	65
CONSIGNED TO OBLIVION	67
NAME OF NATHAN HALE ERASED	69
CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS SLURRED	71
BRITISH OFFERS TO BRIBE	73

VII.

"THE RE-UNITED STATES"	75
THE CARNEGIE MOTIVE POWER	77
CARNEGIE'S DECLARED PURPOSE	79
BRITISH-AMERICAN REUNION	81
THE PENSIONED PROFESSORS	83
PROPAGANDA IN THE CHURCHES	85

VIII.

LOYALIST PUBLIC LIBRARIES	86
THE VITUPERATIVE VAN TYNE	87
A SNEER AT PATRIOTISM	89
THE INTERNATIONAL ALCOVE	91
GROSS SLANDERS OF PATRIOTS	93
HART "RECHARTS" THE "FACTS"	95
FULL CONTROL OF LIBRARIES	97
PRO-BRITISH BOOKS COMMENDED	99

IX.

ENGLISH-SPEAKING UNION	101
ENORMOUS PRO-BRITISH GAINS	103
AMERICAN DISTORTIONS IN ENGLAND	105

CONTENTS

xi

THE FIRST TO SIGN UP	107
"BRITISH PLUCK TRIUMPHS"	109

X.

THE RHODES SCHOLARSHIP FUND	111
QUALITIES OF LEADERSHIP	113
THE TEST OF OUR HISTORY	115

XI.

"INTERDEPENDENCE" DAY	117
ANDREWS AGAIN A LINK	119
VAN TYNE AND MAGNA CHARTA	121
CLEAR REVERSAL OF FACTS	123
DISTINCTIVE AMERICANISM	125

XII.

NOT ACCORD BUT DISCORD	127
AN "ACCORD" TEXT IN ENGLAND	129
WHAT BRITISH TEXTS TEACH	131
"THE NEWER TENDENCIES"	133
NOT A DEBATABLE QUESTION	135
TRIBUTES TO WASHINGTON	137
FAIR STATEMENTS OF FACTS	139
BENEDICT ARNOLDS OF TODAY	141
OBSTACLES TO EXPLOITATION	143

XIII.

ON WAY TO THE JUNK-HEAP	145
THE PATRIOT LEAGUE	147
PATRIOTIC SOCIETIES UNITED	149
STATUTES IN FIVE STATES	151
SOME TEXTS RE-AMERICANIZED	153
CHICAGO'S McANDREW TRIAL	155
WEAK DEFENSE OF AUTHORS	157
MAIN DEFENSE FROM ENGLAND	159

XIV.

MUZZEY IN FULL RETREAT	161
A CLOUD OF CONFUSION	163

CONTENTS

"THERE WERE TWO OPINIONS"	165
BELITTLEMENT OF REVOLUTION	167
A PROCESS OF CORRECTION	169
FALSIFICATION OF YORKTOWN	171
DISTORTION OF WAR OF 1812	173
MUZZEY IS SLOWLY LEARNING	175
STUPIDEST OF BLUNDERS	177
TRENT AFFAIR OBSCURED	179
"IN KING GEORGE'S EYES"	181
SNEERS AT OUR PRESIDENTS	183
SEVERE STIGMAS ATTACHED	185
DEAD SCANDALS REVIVED	187
DEMAGOGIC RAILINGS	189
ACCUMULATION OF SLANDERS	191
AMERICAN SPIRIT SOVEREIGN	193

XV.

"MILLIONS AT STAKE"	194
NEST OF ALIEN AGENCIES	195
PACIFISM AND COMMUNISM	197
POWER OVER THE SCHOOLS	199
COLLEGE SYSTEM LINKED UP	201

XVI.

"THE INTERNATIONAL MIND"	202
A HERITAGE IN TRUST.....	203
INTELLECTUAL DISARMAMENT.....	205
THE TRUE AMERICAN SPIRIT.....	207

THE POISONED LOVING-CUP

I.

A LONDON HISTORY DINNER

An Apt Phrase Coined in Parliament—Peculiar Services to Great Britain Officially Recognized

THE records of the British Parliament of July 21, 1921, furnish the account of this colloquy:

“Mr. T. Thomson arose in his seat in the House of Commons and asked the Prime Minister:

“Are you aware of the costly repast given at Government’s expense in the Savoy Hotel, Friday, July 15, to the Anglo-American professors of history? If so, will you kindly state the actual cost per guest of the dinner?

“Are you aware that many of the American guests considered the parade of expensive refreshments to be quite unnecessary, in view of their nation’s attitude on this matter? Will you consider if greater economy can be exercised at all hospitality functions in the future, in view of the urgent need of national economy?

“In reply to these questions a Government official, speaking for the executive in this case, said:

“The honorable gentleman who administers this fund is reluctant to publish cost sheets of government entertainments, which vary in scale, character and cost; but he is quite willing to meet any honorable members interested in the subject and explain the actual outlays; but he does not share the opinion

that the recent entertainment of the Anglo-American professors was extravagant."

"Mr. Thomson retorted:

"Is the honorable and gallant gentleman aware that the opinion of extravagance is one formed by many of the guests?"

"Mr. MacQuisten added:

"Will the honorable gentleman observe the statement that their view was that the parade of expensive liquid refreshments was quite unnecessary, in view of their national attitude on the matter? He says nothing about their personal attitude, and I am reminded of the Scottish magnate, a teetotaler, who was found drinking champagne at a deputation, and said it was purely local business."

Who and what are "Anglo-American professors of history" is, unfortunately, not stated in the record of Parliament.

"Anglo-American professors of history" is a peculiar term, unknown perhaps to some of us here, but appearing to be well understood by members of the British Parliament.

Let us hope that we also may acquire some idea as to just who and just what are "Anglo-American professors of history," the processes through which they are created, and the ways in which they function.

More than a hundred "Anglo-American professors of

history" from this country attended the London History Dinner, several of whom were soon to become identified as authors of Anglo-American history textbooks since in use in the public schools of the United States.

"American History," we have been used to calling these textbooks. But the British Parliament, more knowingly, as early as 1921, clearly must have recognized them as "Anglo-American" textbooks.

In the period between 1918, when the World War ended, and 1921, when the London History Dinner was given, practically all of our school histories were necessarily reprinted, in order to include the story of the war. Several of the authors took advantage of this opportunity to make extensive alterations in their accounts of the causes and conduct of the American Revolution, the War of 1812 and other Anglo-American differences, with the avowed purpose of fostering Anglo-American accord.

Under the specious plea of promoting "mutual understanding" with Great Britain, some of these revisionists boldly defamed or ignored heroic figures in the founding of our republic, misrepresented the ideals and causes for which they struggled and sacrificed, and grossly misinterpreted the ideals and principles upon which were established our liberties and our Nation.

There is striking significance in the uniformity

with which these revisionists proclaimed their purpose to rewrite American school history from a new viewpoint.

That they all were subject to the same influences becomes apparent in a comparison of their statements in their prefaces.

Prof. Muzzey's Introduction ¹ explained the changed standpoint thus:

"The present volume represents the newer tendencies in historical writing. Its aim is not to tell over once more the old story in the old way, but to give the emphasis to those factors in our national development which appeal to us as most vital from the standpoint of today."

Professors McLaughlin and Van Tyne ² announced the new method:

"We make no apology for the omission of many of the 'yarns' of American history . . .

"By means of this elimination we have secured space for fuller explanation and interpretation of really important events."

Prof. C. H. Ward in his preface ³ assumes the same standpoint:

¹ *An American History, Revised*, 1920.

² *History of the United States for Schools, Revised*, 1919.

³ *Burke's Speech on Conciliation*, 1919.

"As long as there lurks in the back of the American consciousness a suspicion of English tyranny in 1775, so long will misunderstanding prevent the English-speaking nations from working in accord to develop Anglo-Saxon freedom."

Prof. A. B. Hart⁴ declared his purpose was to present:

"Adequate treatment of certain topics which hitherto have been too little stressed in the study of American history.

"The European background of our history is clearly sketched, with due recognition of our inheritance of language, law, and political methods from England. Due attention is also paid to other influences from overseas."

In announcement of Prof. W. B. Guiteau's history⁵ it is declared:

"This book has been written in the light of recent events in which a new atmosphere has been created for the study of our national life.

"The Revolutionary War and subsequent Anglo-American difficulties, hitherto distorted in our school books as a result of national prejudice, have been restated by Dr. Guiteau."

Prof. Willis M. West, also true to the type, and perfectly in harmony with the new spirit and methods

⁴ *School History of the United States, Revised*, 1920.

⁵ *Our United States*, 1919.

of alteration and Anglicization of American school history, declared in his preface⁶ that his first purpose was:

“to emphasize the historical grounds for friendship between America and England, in spite of old sins and misunderstandings. . . . Throughout I have not hesitated to portray the weaknesses, blunders and sins of democracy.”

These, and other authors of school text books all proclaimed the one viewpoint and argued from the one attitude, with unison of ten automatons worked with one wire.

Innumerable drastic alterations having been effected in ten American school histories, in full accordance with this clearly-declared purpose, and the books having been widely accepted into the public school system of our country, sponsored by college presidents and professors, unopposed by schoolmen, and unnoted by the public, our “Anglo-American professors of history” were invited over to England for a celebration of their achievement—for a Fourth of July jollification—and there were dined and wined at the expense of the British Government in such degree of gratitude as to provoke protest in Parliament at the extravagance.

Not that these professors of history had sold their

⁶ *History of the American People*, 1918.

American birthright for a mere Parliamentary mess of pottage! It was by no means so simple a process as that.

Multiform and seductive pro-British propaganda influences which had been effectively operating upon them are to be analyzed in detail later in these pages.

When these historians returned to us, many of them were boasting English college degrees, many of them were be-ribboned with British decorations, bestowed not for valorous service to their own country but for betrayal of it, and all of them bearing the brand of Parliament as "Anglo-American professors of history."

We have in our midst, for instance, Professor Albert Bushnell Hart, Ph.D., LL.D., Litt.D.; Professor Charles Downer Hazen, A.B., Ph.D., LL.D., L.H.D., Litt.D., Chevalier of the Legion of Honor; and Professor William Roscoe Thayer, A.B., A.M., LL.D., Litt.D., L.H.D., Knight of the Order of the Crown of Italy, and of the Order of Saints Maurizio and Lazzaro. Scholastic kites, thus amply tailed, and with attached string skillfully tensioned, are sailing high and serenely as Anglo-American historical authorities.

If frequent use is now made of this peculiarly expressive phrase, "Anglo-American professors of history," it must be borne in mind that it is not of any base coinage, but is officially the coinage of the British Parliament.

II.

THE TREASON TEXTS

Patriots Slandered and Benedict Arnold Praised —Revisionists Stultified by Contradictions

THE defamation of our nation's founders that had suddenly appeared in the altered texts is indeed astounding.

Three of them ¹ present John Hancock as a "smugler" only, with not one word of his great public services.

Samuel Adams fares little better. West calls him "the first American political boss," ² and Hart calls him "a shrewd, hard-headed politician." ³ These are the only characterizations given him.

Five of them teach that Alexander Hamilton is said to have once exclaimed:

"Your people, sir, is a great beast!" ⁴

Six proclaim this to have been a popular toast:

¹ Everett Barnes: *Short American History for Grammar Grades*, Vol. II, p. 9; McLaughlin and Van Tyne: *History of the United States for Schools*, 1919, pp. 140, 146.

² *History of the American People*.

³ *School History of the United States, Revised*, 1920, p. 125.

⁴ Hart, p. 151; McLaughlin and Van Tyne, p. 238; Muzzey: *An American History, Revised*, 1920, p. 162; Guitteau: *Our United States*, 1919, p. 242.

"Thomas Jefferson: May he receive from his fellow citizens the reward of his merit—a halter!"

Hart teaches that Jefferson was looked upon by Federalists as "an atheist, a liar and a demagogue."⁵ That others regarded him differently is not hinted.

Patrick Henry is set forth to our children as "a gay, unprosperous and unknown country lawyer."⁶

It is taught of Washington:

"If you had called him an 'American' he would have thought you were using a kind of nickname. He was proud of being an Englishman."⁷

One has given a half-page of praise and extenuation to Benedict Arnold. In the same book those patriot statesmen, who, despite their human shortcomings and handicaps, despite the stupendous task they faced, did overcome immeasurable obstacles, did draw the colonies into united action, did establish helpful foreign relations and did direct the Revolution to a successful issue, are disposed of in a group characterization thus:

"The Continental Congress was a shameful scene of petty bickerings and schemings among selfish, unworthy, shortsighted, narrow-minded, office-seeking and office-trading plotters."⁸

"We can afford now to laugh at our forefathers,"

⁵ p. 190.

⁶ McLaughlin and Van Tyne, p. 141.

⁷ Ward: *Burke's Speech*, p. 10.

⁸ E. Barnes: *Short History*, p. 34.

two of these Anglo-American authors observe.⁹

Clearly it was to discredit and destroy fundamental American political ideals, principles and policies in the minds of American future citizenry, and to set British annals and imperialistic policies in their stead, that these histories were rewritten.

Accordingly the revisionists set out to teach that the English Magna Charta is the real source of our liberties, that our Declaration of Independence was substantially plagiarized from English writers, and that the Constitution of the United States is in essence merely a written copy of the unwritten English constitution.

Steadily running through all is fulsome laudation of British democracy, British ideals, British institutions and British achievements, those of America being made to appear as but poor imitations.

The War of 1812 is declared a "mistake,"¹⁰ "disgraceful"¹¹ and "an unfortunate conflict between sister nations of the English tongue."¹²

It is taught that the Mexican War was a "grab of territory";¹³

⁹ McLaughlin and Van Tyne, p. 262.

¹⁰ E. Barnes, p. 151.

¹¹ West, p. 395.

¹² Muzzey, p. 184.

¹³ West, p. 515.

That the North saved the Union only through "England's heroic support";¹⁴

That our War with Spain was won only because England prevented Germany and all Europe from taking sides against us;¹⁵

That prior to our laggard entrance into the World War, "our fancied security was due only to the protecting shield of Britain's fleet."¹⁶

Our children in the schools are taught in these texts that "our country's history has been hitherto distorted through unthinking adherence to traditional prejudices";¹⁷ but was now to be "set right" through "newer tendencies in historical writing,"¹⁸ "scientific exactness of higher historical scholarship" and "emotions of new-found gratitude to England."¹⁹

There is much supercilious assertion or obvious implication by these authors that their alterations are results of their own "modern scientific researches" and "deductions" and "exactness" of "higher historical scholarship"; and constantly forced is the inference that our great and simple truths have become so complex and abstruse as to have passed beyond the comprehension of any minds but those of this "higher historical scholarship."

¹⁴ West, p. 577.

¹⁵ Ibid, p. 633.

¹⁶ Ibid, p. 720.

¹⁷ Guitteau, Preface.

¹⁸ Muzzey, Editorial Preface.

¹⁹ Ward, Introduction.

Really, their self-asserted new superior methods are not modern, or historical, or scholarly; they are not, at all, new or superior; they are such as have been only too commonly in use ever since the first crooked special pleader began to trim facts to fit his case.

The pretension of devotion to truth which these revisionists make might cause the unthinking to reverence them as consecrated savants faithfully patrolling the seashore of the past, and patiently gathering into our annals the grains of gold cast up in the shifting sands of Time.

The picture is a pretty one, but not true. The true one is not so pretty. With their shameless defamations and distortions they are more like ghouls digging in the graveyards of dead hatreds for long-buried falsehoods and foulsome slanders.

Their self-assumed superiority of methods lacks support. Comparisons among the altered texts readily render their claims to "scientific exactness" ludicrously absurd. Let us see:

"The colonists were not desperately oppressed. In no other country in the world were the people so well-housed, well-fed and comfortable."—A. B. Hart: *School History of the United States, Revised*, 1920 p. 126.

"The colonists were poor, and it seemed foolhardy to brave the anger of England's king."—Everett

Barnes: *American History for Grammar Grades, Revised*, 1920, p. 16.

Really, were the colonists well-off, as Hart says? Or poor, as this other says? Anyway, the two agree at least that the Revolution was not justified in sound sense, which is all they care about.

But let us see further. We find an amazing jumble of contradictions:

"The governmental oppression that caused the Revolution was 'made in Germany.' Now there is a villain in the story, and we learn a very useful truth about English freedom."—C. H. Ward: Introduction to *Burke's Speech*, 1919, p. 8.

If that is true, then ponder well the next:

"The American Revolution developed into a coalition of four powers against Great Britain, and the American continent became again, for the fifth time within a century, the ground on which France and England fought out their mighty duel."—D. S. Muzzey: *An American History, Revised*, 1920, pp. 118-9.

And again something quite different:

"The disputes that brought about the war were not between the colonists and all the English at home; they were rather between the Tories and the Whigs on both sides of the sea, neighbor against neighbor."—Everett Barnes: *Short American History*, 1920, Vol. II, p. 21.

And then this:

"The American Revolution is no longer studied as an isolated event resulting from British injustice."

—W. B. Guitteau: *Our United States*, 1919, p. 5.

And this:

"It was a part of the thousand-year-long contest between the English-speaking people and their kings for more political liberty."—W. M. West: *History of the American People*, 1918, p. 191.

Any mind which might reconcile all these contradictory statements into accord and "scientific exactness" must still be sorely puzzled over this:

"There is little use trying to learn whose fault it was that the war began; as in most quarrels the blame is laid by one party on the other."—A. C. McLaughlin & C. H. Van Tyne: *History of the United States for Schools, Revised*, 1919, p. 152.

Had these revisionists worked from separate viewpoints, and had found like facts and uniform theories, there might have been less question about "scientific methods" of research. But since all have proclaimed the same starting-point and objective, yet have arrived with conflicting sets of statements and irreconcilable theories, their own contradictions prove disastrous to their pretense of "scientific exactness."

If any one of these histories tells the truth regarding the causes of the Revolution, then all the rest of them must be false. If the statement of grievances in the Declaration of Independence be true, then all of these

are false. Such "scientific exactness" explodes of internal combustion.

How does it chance, then, that these revisionists, reasoning from irreconcilable facts (if by courtesy they may be called facts and it may be called reasoning), have so neatly united on the one propaganda objective—that the Declaration of Independence was falsehood and the Revolution a farce?

Since they all have cast overboard the statement of grievances in the Declaration of Independence and thrown after it the annals and traditions left us by the fathers, by what new chart or compass may it be known that these revisionists, yawing in ten directions, are sailing on a "scientific" course?

The answer is obvious and simple. To the designs of the propaganda it does not matter which of these new theories be established in our public schools—that the English and the colonists alike revolted against a "German" king, or that there was not much oppression, or that it was a four-power coalition against Britain, or that it was a mere duel between France and England, or that it was only a party contest between neighbors, or that the whole petty affair is so obscure and inconsequential that there is little use trying to find out anything about it—; the inevitable and decisive effect must be that American school children, our citizenry of the

future, shall discredit, doubt, dispute over, or never know, the inspiring truth of the causes for which the Revolution was fought and the high principles upon which our nation was founded and stands, but must learn to look to Britain for example of ideals, achievement and worth.

What is taught to our children in the schools determines our nation's destiny.

True hero worship is healthy. It stimulates the young to virile aspirations and gives to the masses high models of manhood. The history of a nation is the test of its ideals, the mainstay of its morale and the propulsive force in its purposes.

In our own heroes and true history our nation has been exceptionally blessed. These have proved unfailing sources of pride and inspiration that have prompted us as a people to staunch character, unparalleled achievement, unprecedented progress and prestige and world-wide service in liberation and elevation of mankind.

III.

OFFICIAL BRITISH PROPAGANDA

Activities of Parker and Harmsworth—Rewriting of Our Text Books Openly Promised in England

OFFICIAL British influences that have been directly at work to bring about the emasculation of American history and the destruction of our national spirit and morale are not only recognizable but confessed and even boasted.

Sir Gilbert Parker, novelist and professional British propagandist, in an article in *Harper's Magazine*, March, 1918, openly outlined some of his methods of "putting it over" on the American people before we went into the World War.

"Practically since the day the war broke out between England and the Central Powers I became responsible for American publicity," Parker says. "I need hardly say that the scope of my department was very extensive and its activities widely ranged."

The propaganda that Sir Gilbert boasts he was putting over was six-fold:

That the Revolution was a contest between George III, a German, on one side, and the English people and American colonists on the other;

That "many Americans regret the War of 1812, as most Britishers regret the acts of George III";

That "the greatest enemy of American development was Napoleon"; but Great Britain saved us from conquest by him;

That it was the British Foreign Minister, Canning, who gave us the Monroe Doctrine and made it an accepted fact;

That "the British navy and behind it the British Government has been the best friend that the United States ever had in its history";

And that, "next to Great Britain, the best friend the United States has today is Japan."

All this was effective, Sir Gilbert says, in universities, colleges, historical societies, clubs and newspapers, and:

"Among the activities was a weekly report to the British cabinet upon the state of American opinion, and constant touch with the permanent correspondents of American newspapers in England. . . . Among other things we supplied 360 newspapers in the smaller States of the United States with an English newspaper.

"We advised and stimulated many people to write articles; we utilized the friendly services and assistance of confidential friends; we had reports from important Americans constantly; and established association by personal correspondence with influential and eminent people of every profession in the United

States, beginning with university and college presidents, professors and scientific men, and running through all the ranges of the population. . . .

"It is hardly necessary to say that our work was one of extreme difficulty and delicacy."

This was war-time propaganda, of course, or rather, for us, it was pre-war propaganda to get us into the conflict, and as such, might be granted some doubtful justification. But the war ended, and what resulted? Why, these inventions of a skillful fictionist proved to have been far more effective in the universities, colleges, historical societies, teachers' associations, clubs and newspapers than Sir Gilbert himself could reasonably have hoped.

The influence which Sir Gilbert boasts was by no means the only influence of like character directly at work.

Other official British propagandists have freely boasted. Sir Gilbert was succeeded as the head of British propaganda in this country by Sir Alfred Harmsworth. When Harmsworth had completed his vast organization, and was returning home, he announced through the press that he was leaving behind him \$150,000,000 and 10,000 trained agents, to carry on the work after the war. And as to the nature of the Harmsworth propaganda, to be carried on by 10,000 trained agents, with \$150,000,000 at their disposal, Harmsworth has been quite frank.

The *London Times*, then owned and edited by Harmsworth, in the issue of July 4, 1919, rendered an account of what was called "efficient propaganda," which he had inaugurated here and was being "carried out by those trained in the arts of creating public good-will and of swaying public opinion toward a definite purpose."

Among the methods then in operation in this country, or in prospect, as stated in the *London Times* of the date named, were these:

"Efficiently organized propaganda to mobilize the press, the church, the stage and the cinema; to press into active service the whole educational system, the universities, public and high schools and primary schools; to provide for subsidizing the best men to write books and articles. . . . Histories and text books upon literature should be revised. New books should be added, particularly in the primary schools. Hundreds of exchange university scholarships should be provided. Local societies should be formed in every center to foster British-American good-will, in close cooperation with an administrative committee."

This same Fourth of July issue of the *London Times* contained a signed article by Owen Wister, American-born author, in which he said:

"A movement to correct the school books of the United States has been started, and it will go on."

George H. Putnam, it shall be noted, in a speech

at the birth of the English-Speaking Union in London, in July, 1918, said that he wanted to see:

“not the Declaration of Independence, but a Declaration of Interdependence—an acknowledgment that the two peoples belong together;”

and he added that the American school histories were being rewritten to this purpose, and that the United States Government was already securely in the hands of the pro-British element.

Here, then, is ample array of evidence and open professions of active forces at work to a definite purpose.

All this might mean much, or nothing, according to the results. The results are seen in a dozen altered text books in our schools, in which American history is grossly distorted and de-Americanized, in the interest of British-American union.

When men have proclaimed their purpose to bring about certain results, have devised measures to produce those results, have predicted that those results are about to appear, and then they do appear, precisely true to promise, how can any sane mind question direct connection?

Who could have the hardihood to say that Parker, Harmsworth and Putnam, in their planning and prophesying new versions of American history, were only talking idly, that the great propaganda organizations they

boast they established to carry out this declared design were only phantoms dancing in the air, and that the prompt appearance of the Anglicized school histories happened only by chance coincidence?

Anybody who could believe this must believe also that our "Anglo-American professors of history," when they had produced the Anglicized texts, were invited to England, feasted, degreed, beribboned and bedazzled, at British Government expense, because of their social charms only.

Admitted that honest purpose to promote Anglo-American accord has merit, still the ugly fact obtrudes that the gravest menace to accord between America and Great Britain today lies in the pernicious and persistent British propaganda maintained in this country, through which not alone our history, but our financial, industrial, political and even ecclesiastical institutions are misrepresented to our own people.

That this ugly fact is not without recognition even in England the following editorial protest of the *New Statesman* of London shows:

"Many American people who from the beginning have been ardent supporters of the allied cause are concerned not with the eagerness but with the lavish unintelligence of the publicity methods we have adopted. They doubt the wisdom of our elaborate pretense of doing nothing officially when evidences

of an extensive activity are everywhere apparent.

"They suspect the existence of British control of certain American newspapers. They criticize a certain kind of English speaker and journalist. Much of the writing and speaking in behalf of England has been of a kind which would be condemned by anyone possessing a fair knowledge of the American mind and temperament."

This is no rare instance of English criticism of the British propaganda that is objected to here. The London *Daily Express* also protested recently in an editorial, "America and Ourselves," as follows:

"Sir Auckland Geddes, a former British ambassador to the United States, made an astonishing remark in opening the branch of the English-Speaking Union. He said that the Americans in the mass do not understand us or our needs at all, and that we in the mass do not really understand them or their needs. We believe Sir Auckland to be right, though, unlike him, we do not worry about it. But it is an odd result to show for three decades of the "hands across the sea" business, the Pilgrims' dinners, the English-Speaking Union's luncheons, endless perorations, articles and addresses and incidentally a war fought for a few months side by side as members of one team. On the testimony of this very competent observer there are still, at one end of it all, enormous gaps in the two peoples' comprehension of one another.

"But does it much matter? Does it rather not show that Anglo-American relations are at their best when they are least discussed, and that all this well mean-

ing passion for propaganda produces no positive and beneficent result one-half so powerful as the reaction and the antagonisms and the suspicions it inevitably tends to provoke? It is really a waste of time to attempt to manufacture any further ties than those that self-interest, a huge volume of personal and commercial intercourse and the plain facts of international politics have already rubbed into the consciousness of all thinking people on both sides of the Atlantic. Anglo-American relations are the last in the world to need gush, rhetoric, or advertisement. Unfortunately they have been in the past the greatest victims of these disturbers of international sanity."

The methods thus criticized even in England are increasingly put into force throughout America. A vast portion of this propaganda, steadily flowing through our newspapers, magazines, movies, books, radio, lecture platforms and pulpits, bank and commercial circulars and countless other channels, is generally unsuspected and fully effective. There can be no doubt in any sane and fair-thinking mind that this propaganda is responsible for the stealthy but concentrated movement to alter and denature American history texts used in our public schools.

It must clearly be seen that all this avowed purpose merely to promote international accord, even if genuine, has no proper part in school education, but is political propaganda, and the methods are damnable.

If slander of our forefathers and surrender of our

traditions and ideals are to be partial payment in the price we are expected to pay for friendship with any foreign nation, then, desirable as friendship with all foreign nations is admitted to be, we had better abandon at once any such project of purchase, for it is a process of our own national prostitution and subjection.

By this process of "promoting friendship," if the Americanism of this generation cannot be tricked or debauched into alliance, the Americanism of the next generation is to be deceived and debased into ignorant and unresisting acquiescence.

Our nation never yet has had to violate its basic principles, repudiate its history and degrade its self-respect to form any desired foreign friendships. Wholesome cultivation and assertion of our own national character, inherited from heroic fathers, has always been and always must be our best guaranty of honest and enduring friendships.

Let us not so cheaply sell our glorious birthright. Let us, instead, devote ourselves to a revival of better understanding and relations among our own people. Let us devote ourselves to promotion of our own appreciation of the true history, ideals, purposes and fixed policies of our great Republic. Let us devote ourselves to development of more genuine and more virile American national spirit, solidarity and morale.

The freedom-seeking world is looking to American democracy for leadership. But American democracy itself is severely at test, floundering, as it is, in a morass of foreign-designed falsehoods.

American democracy, proudly as we boast it and toast it, has no virtue and power to direct and save even itself unless guided by the truth. The soul of democracy is truth. Democracy is impotent in ignorance and dangerous in delusion—a blinded Samson staggering perilously amid the pillars of the temple.

Will a warned and awakened free people tolerate the insidious and insolent imposition of foreign propaganda not only in histories but in every channel of public intelligence? Or are we already so infected and stupefied by it as to be the last generation of Americans to be brought up in the faith of the fathers?

Can we summon up enough of the old-time American spirit to make right and timely answer?

Prompt response should come from the heart of every loyal American in these words of Daniel Webster, which ought to be placarded on every school-house door:

"I shall know but one country. The ends I aim at shall be my Country's, my God's and Truth's. I was born an American; I live an American; I shall die an American; and I intend to perform the duties incumbent upon me in that character to the end of my career."

IV.

BRITISH HISTORY TRANSPLANTED

Hostile Versions of the American Revolution and Its Heroes Appear Bodily in Our Text Books

NEW teachings in the altered school histories are not only traced to British influences, but many of them are definitely traced to British historical sources.

West's high school text, *History of the American People*, 1918, on page 195, presents to American youth the following characterization of some of the leading founders of our Republic:

"Englishmen of that day believed sincerely that the Revolution was the work of a group of 'sore-heads.' George Washington, as a youth, had been refused a coveted commission in the British army. Sam Adams' father had been ruined by the wise British veto of a proposed Massachusetts 'Land Bank.' The older Otis had failed to secure an appointment on the Massachusetts bench. Alexander Hamilton was a penniless and briefless law student, with no chance for special advancement, unless by fishing in troubled waters."

This not only reads like British history of America; it IS British history. The source of this is Sir George Otto Trevelyan's *The American Revolution*. In this British history, Vol. I, page 375, Sir George says:

"According to the theory accepted by those circles, Otis started the agitation, which started everything, because his father had missed a judgeship. Joseph Warren was a broken man, and sought to mend his fortunes by upsetting those of others. John Hancock, too rich to want a place, suffered from wounded vanity when walking behind his betters in the order of precedence. Richard Henry Lee had been baulked of an appointment as Distributor of Stamps under the Act, which then, and only then, he came forward to denounce. John Adams turned rebel because he was refused a Commission of Peace; and Washington himself never forgave the British War Office for having treated him with the neglect which was the natural portion of Provincial military officers."

None can fail to note the striking similarity between Trevelyan's and West's statement. After the first qualifying sentence each drops into direct assertion. Sub-conscious imitation in style and method is as marked as is the similarity in substance.

West, in teaching American children, has repeated this British defamation all but verbatim.

Here, then, is a clear, concrete example of one method by which certain American school histories have been Anglicized. It is absurdly simple. Nothing is required but a pro-British spirit, a British history, a pair of shears and a pastepot.

Gross alteration of our records of foreign relations, as direct result of British propaganda, would seem to

represent the utmost reach of imperialistic audacity. But not so; for the same organized and recognizable influences have been taking still further advantage of our amiable trust and inattention.

The Anglo-American revisionists who have been transplanting hostile British versions into our public school texts have not only sought to influence our reunion with the "Mother Country"; they have been sowing quick seeds of dissension and discord among our own people.

It is to be seen with clearness that efforts have been made with astounding success to implant in American school history the British version of the causes of the American Civil War.

The theory that Lincoln, through perfidy and broken promises, caused the Civil War is zealously set forth in the school text book, *American History and Government*, 1921, now in use in the public schools of many sections of the United States.

The author of this book, Matthew Page Andrews, Anglo-American historian and Director of the English-Speaking Union, is teaching American school children through his pro-British text book that Lincoln was called the "Slave Hound of Illinois";

That not slavery but the tariff divided the North and South;

That secession was a Northern principle;

That slavery was discontinued in the North only for economic reasons;

That most Southerners desired and many tried to free their slaves, but Northerners would not permit them to do so;

That the condition of the slaves was far better than that of factory workers of the North;

And that finally the Emancipation Proclamation was a mere political play and moral pretense, as it could have no possible application "except to slaves over which President Lincoln had no jurisdiction."

The elements controlling Lincoln are defined by Andrews thus:

"'Without a little blood-letting,' one of the radicals is quoted as saying, 'this Union will not, in my estimation, be worth a rush.' Apparently, he and his associates sought to bring on a conflict which they thought would be brief, sharp and splendidly decisive."—Page 311.

Surely so serious a statement as this, said to have caused such tremendous consequences, should be presented by a "scientific" historian upon more definite authority than merely "one of the radicals." Where Andrews found this anonymous quotation about "a little

blood-letting” he does not hint; nevertheless, its source is readily traceable.

This and his other falsities have been lifted bodily out of a British history, where they have been preserved, like dead insects in vinegar, and set into American school history by a Director of the English-Speaking Union. A British *History of the United States* by the Englishman, Percy Greg, published in London, 1887, reads, Vol. II, page 205:

“The Union will be worth nothing without a little blood-letting.’ So spoke a favorite counsellor of Abraham Lincoln; and such was the spirit of his chief and colleagues.”

What appeared in a British history in 1887 became American school history in 1918.

Matthew Page Andrews, in lifting the above out of Greg’s British version and setting it into an American school text book, was not stooping to mere plagiarism; he added an idea of his own—that Lincoln and his counsellors “sought to bring on a conflict which they thought would be brief, sharp and splendidly decisive.”

Greg’s *History of the United States* is popularly accepted in England as an especially authoritative British presentation of American affairs from the founding of the Virginia Colony to the close of the Civil War. It is proclaimed to be “thorough and exhaustive,” making

two volumes of about 500 pages each. This Greg history, so popular in England, is so hostile toward America, especially regarding our Civil War, that it never has been offered for sale in our North. They who will follow the exposures to be made regarding the Anglicization of our school histories will readily recognize this Greg's *History of the United States* as a favorite "source book" and "modern scientific historical authority" for innumerable alterations of American annals.

Greg furnishes the now familiar "*Hancock, the smuggler*," "*Ethan Allen, the braggart*," "*the unscrupulous Sam Adams*" and many another of the malignant epithets which the Anglo-American revisionists have fastened upon our heroic characters in our school histories.

Some further English versions found in Greg which have become odiously familiar in our Anglicized texts are such as follow:

"Not only had the Mother Country sent fleets and regiments to protect her American provinces—she had paid them liberally for defending themselves."
—Vol. I, Page 114.¹

¹ Benjamin Franklin, in his examination before the House of Commons, testified as follows:

Q. Do you think it right that America should be protected by this country and pay no part of the expense?

A. That is not the case. The colonies raised, clothed and paid, during the last war, near twenty-five thousand men, and spent many millions.

Q. Were you not reimbursed by the Parliament?

A. We were only reimbursed what, in your opinion, we had advanced

"Paid by England for fighting their own battles, the first effort of the colonies was to refuse quarters to the troops she sent to defend them."—Page 115.

Revisionist West has seriously caught the infection:

"The English colonial system had guided and guarded the colonies while they needed help and protection. It was not tyrannical."—*History of the American People*, p. 185.

It is not strange, or to be complained of, that British history holds to the British attitude regarding the Revolution.

What is complained of is that our "Anglo-American professors of history" are so readily persuaded to discard the annals of our fathers in favor of the versions of their foes.

What is still more to be complained of is that British

beyond our proportion, or beyond what might reasonably be expected from us; and it was a very small part of what we spent. Pennsylvania, in particular, disbursed about 500,000 pounds, and the reimbursements on the whole did not exceed 60,000 pounds.

Q. Do you think the people of America would submit to pay the stamp duty if it was moderated?

A. No, never, unless compelled by force of arms.

Q. What was the temper of America toward Great Britain *before the year 1763*?

A. The best in the world. They submitted willingly to the government of the Crown, and paid, in their courts, obedience to acts of Parliament. Numerous as the people are in the several old provinces, they cost you nothing in forts, citadels, garrisons or armies to keep them in subjection. They were governed by this country at the expense only of a little pen, ink and paper; they were led by a thread."

versions of our Civil War, contemptuously hostile to the cause of the Union, are now bodily transferred, directly through a Director of the English-Speaking Union, into United States school history.

The magical transformation of King George III from a born Briton into a "German," in many American histories recently revised, furnishes an astonishing manifestation of the all but occult power of British propaganda in the United States.

How complete is this transformation may be realized only when seen in specific instances of alteration in the text books.

In the 1916 edition of his school text, *New American History*, Prof. Albert Bushnell Hart was teaching:

"To this day it is not easy to see just why the colonists felt so dissatisfied. They professed and doubtless felt the warmest attachment to the king, whom God and Parliament had provided for them."
—Page 120.

He added this familiar fact:

"George III in one of his early speeches said, 'Born and educated in this country, I glory in the name of Briton'."

In 1916-1917, however, the forces of British propaganda were increasing to intensity their influences to quicken in America hatred of Germany and to hurry us

into the war and into permanent alliance. By somehow shifting the odium of even the American Revolution from England to Germany in our minds two birds might be killed with one stone.

We always had been contemptuously regarded by the English upper classes as ignorant in all things, and our utter ignorance of English history, and even of our own, was taken for granted. We were not supposed to know that the great English historical authority, Macaulay, says of George III:

“The young king was a born Englishman. All his tastes and habits, good and bad, were English.”

Suddenly our Anglicized revisionists began to teach American school children:

“The American Revolution was ‘made in Germany’;”

“The American Revolution was not an attempt of England to tyrannize over colonies, but was a quarrel fomented by a German king as a part of his programme of despotic ambition”;

“The American Revolution was a contest between German tyranny and English freedom”;

“Now there is a villain in the story, and we learn a very useful truth about English freedom.”

This group of gross perversions just quoted is gathered from a single American high school text book,

(1919) which deals exclusively with the causes of the American Revolution, by Prof. C. H. Ward.

This is the Prof. Ward who in a long newspaper letter,² retorting to complaints made against his book, wrote the following outstanding sentence:

"I do not presume to teach young Americans my own interpretations of history; I present to them only what Lecky and Trevelyan wrote."

These two authorities are outright British, of course; and this complete admission seems to settle the whole question as to the transplanting of British versions of the Revolution into American school history, clearly enough, so far at least as Ward is concerned.

But in classing George III as a German, Prof. Ward has not even the support he claims in Lecky; on the contrary, Lecky in his *History of England in the Eighteenth Century* says of George III:

"The new sovereign came to the throne amid an enthusiasm such as England had hardly seen since Charles II restored the monarchy. By the common consent of all parties the dynastic contest was regarded as closed, and after two generations of foreign and unsympathetic rulers, the nation, which has always been peculiarly intolerant of strangers, accepted with delight an English king."

Prof. Ward's sole remaining confessed authority,

² *New York Times*, Sept. 28, 1921.

then, must be Trevelyan, and Trevelyan it is—the Trevelyan British history, *The American Revolution*, which, as is frankly stated in its 1917 Preface, was “completely rearranged and somewhat rewritten” and reprinted in April, 1917, to the end that the revised work might help to change “the feeling with which Americans will hereafter regard Great Britain” and afford better basis upon which “most of the school histories of the United States” were to “be rewritten.”

The hasty 1917 revision of this monumental six-volume British history, *The American Revolution*, was made for the acknowledged purpose of injecting into the war-time propaganda the fiction that the majority of the English people had sympathized with the American Colonists in their revolt against the “German” tyrant, George III.

In true spirit of Anglo-American reciprocation, Sir George embedded in his Preface the following sweet sentiment, credited to “a well-known New York journal”:³

“We have been able to reproduce only a small part of the evidence brought forward by Sir George Trevelyan to show that the majority of the British people were opposed to the attempt to coerce the American Colonies. In our opinion, all candid readers of these volumes will acknowledge that he has proved his case.

³ *New York Times*.

"It would not be easy to overestimate the effect which such a demonstration ought to have, and doubtless will have, on the feeling with which Americans will hereafter regard Great Britain. It is manifest that most of our school histories of the United States will have to be rewritten, for the major part of them fail to recognize the momentous truth which the work before us must be held to have established."

Following the quoted passage, Sir George adds for himself:

"The only return for such indulgence which the author can make is to do his best to deserve it. . . . He is conscious that the first part, which was published in 1899, made its appearance originally in defective form. That first part has now been completely rearranged and somewhat rewritten."

The motive is thus established beyond denial, even if the "momentous truth" is not. Trevelyan's *American Revolution*, revised 1917, embodying this newly-invented theory designed to cause the rewriting of American school histories and to warm the feeling of Americans toward Great Britain, was most zealously boomed for distribution in the United States, but never in England, where the critics generally have condemned it.

This was British history of America for pro-British Americans, revised while the World War was on and when every possible artifice in British propaganda was being employed to establish a British mandate over

American public opinion, to stampede America into the conflict and into permanent alliance with Great Britain.

Parrot-like, ten of our school historians promptly began repeating this theory to American school children. Mushroom propaganda of the poisonous genus, springing out of the muck of wartime emergency, was to be perpetuated in American school histories.

From O'Hara's *School History of the United States*, revised 1919, the impression would be gained even by mature minds that the American Revolution was conceived and carried to triumph not by the colonists themselves, but by the devoted friends of English freedom in England; while Everett Barnes turned to teaching thus:

"The disputes that brought about the war were not between the colonists and all the English at home; they were between the Tories and the Whigs on both sides of the sea, neighbor against neighbor."

Sir George Trevelyan himself, in revising part of one volume to insert the theory that the majority of the English people had sympathized with the American colonists, fatally overlooked throughout his six volumes frequent and strong assertions of his own to the contrary.

Three typical instances suffice to illustrate this:

"It is true that in Great Britain opinion was very far from unanimous; but opposition to the Government policy went no further than speeches in the two

chambers, and epistles signed by one or another ancient Roman in the newspapers."—Vol. II, p. 105.

"The exultation in America was in full proportion, and somewhat over, to the chagrin and disappointment which prevailed in England."—Vol. IV, p. 67.

"Graver news had seldom crossed the Atlantic. Although the latest occurrences in America were not gravely studied in London, and their full import was understood only by the wise, hopes had been excited by Burgoyne's first successes, by Howe's victory on the Brandywine and by the capture of Philadelphia. The catastrophe at Saratoga had been received with disappointment and something very nearly approaching to dismay. But Sir Henry Clinton's retirement upon New York, which was the most significant event in the whole war, attracted little attention in English society and scanty comment in the press."—Vol. IV, p. 387.

Strange attitude is this of being elated over American defeats and downcast over American victories, when not indifferent to either, in a people whose sympathies are now asserted in revised pages to have been with the colonists.

Benjamin Franklin wrote from England:

"Every man seems to consider himself as a piece of a sovereign over America; seems to jostle himself into the throne with the king, and talks of OUR subjects in the colonies."

The statement in the Declaration of Independence settled this matter long ago to the satisfaction of the American people:

"Nor have we been wanting in our attention to our British brethren. They too have been deaf to the voice of justice and consanguinity."

However, the strict lines of official British propaganda had in 1917 been laid down, and there were Anglo-maniacs in America to follow them blindly. The stealthy rewriting of our school histories was but one manifestation.

The Anglo-American professorial puppets in Anglicizing our school histories have been jumbling together both the old and the new British versions. They have been zealously stressing the oppressive tyrannies of a "German" king, while at the same time disavowing that there were any oppressions or tyranny. They create irreconcilable contradictions through which either sophistry destroys the other, in any mind but that of a child. But it is upon the mind of the school child that these impositions are attempted, that false impressions may delude our citizenry of the future.

V.

HISTORY TEACHERS COERCED

Forced to Sponsor the Treason Texts for Cultivation of a Pro-British State of Mind

OUR "Anglo-American professors" who cynically sneer at the idea that any sane mind ever even dreamed so absurd a thing as British-American union had better take some of the funds of the Carnegie Bureau for Historical Research, which they now are so lavishly devoting to the fabrication of synthetic falsehoods, and devote them to a real Carnegie research, and learn the declared purpose of Carnegie, whose "dead hand" grips and directs them.

The American Historical Association, which has in three annual conventions strongly endorsed Anglicized school histories and highly commended our "Anglo-American professors," and which is now appealing for a million dollar research fund of its own, had better devote that fund to research into the Anglomania of its own members and how they got that way.

Anglicization of American school histories and the ready adoption of the altered texts by many thousands of public schools came about through powerful, organized influences directed upon authors to induce revision, upon college professors to indorse it, and upon public

school superintendents, principals and teachers to set up a demand for it from the public school system itself. One direct process of inflation of a balloon-like demand from teachers is now to be definitely traced.

Columbia University is America's largest institution for the training of school teachers. It originally was King's College, and to this day a flagstaff on its campus is capped with a crown of King George and flies the ensign of his sovereignty. An "Office of the Crown" is still maintained there. Headquartered at Columbia are three of the British Propaganda departments of the Carnegie Foundation—the Institute of International Education, the Carnegie Endowment for World Peace and the American Association for International Conciliation. The American Historical Association is quartered there with them. The chairman of all three of these Carnegie bureaus is President Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia, chief advocate of the "International Mind," which means the British mind active in America. Here the Carnegie funds for college endowments, professors' pensions and annuities are dispensed to best advantage for stimulation of pro-British sentiment and utterance.

In this atmosphere many thousands of school teachers from all over the country are trained each year. Thousands are here trained to go out and teach teachers elsewhere. The Columbia Teachers' College faculty inherently possesses and widely exercises powerful influ-

ence in appointments and promotions of college professors and school superintendents, principals and history teachers throughout the land.

When our colonial forefathers were resisting British oppression, the president of King's College, a violent Tory, issued a threat that unless there was prompt submission the King was prepared to arm the Indian tribes and set them upon our border settlements to murder and pillage and be paid liberal bounties for scalps. This Tory precedent seems to persist at Columbia with the royal crown of King George.

Today it is those at the guard-posts of our public schools—our history teachers—who have been menaced with professional extinction if they refuse to submit to Anglicization.

Through shrewd application of the vast Carnegie funds in endowments, pensions, perquisites and annuities, and the power to control employment and promotion in the public school system, the rule has become established that history teachers must saturate themselves with the treason teachings of Van Tyne and Schlesinger, Beer and Hart and Muzzey, if they would hope for marks for advancement; and the treason spirit they are forced to imbibe they must transmit in their teachings in the schools.

Stenographic record of a University of Chicago Teachers' Class session, which was introduced in evi-

dence in the McAndrew trial, illustrates concretely the sort of Anglicized teaching of history teachers which now prevails in teachers' training schools. The text book used, with which the professor in charge of the class was ardently in sympathy, was Prof. A. M. Schlesinger's *New Viewpoints in American History*, which insolently characterizes George Washington as a "traitor" and "rebel." One teacher in a class of forty had courage enough to protest, and spirit enough to put the professor to rout; but she was not under Supt. McAndrew permitted to teach history in the Chicago public schools.

Most history teachers have been submitting to this powerful coercion. Many of them still submit. The righteous indignation of aroused American patriotism, asserted in the election of patriotic school boards and the selection of patriotic superintendents and truthful history text books, can alone liberate the public school system from this shameful bondage to un-American interests.

Referring to this condition and its direct results in the public schools, President-General Ernest E. Rogers of the National Society Sons of the American Revolution has declared through the official Bulletin of that Society:

"I feel very strongly on this matter and wish that public opinion could be aroused throughout this broad land of ours *to demand that teachers of history*

should themselves be American in thought, word and deed. Our American institutions must not be allowed to falter, fail or weaken."

The Committee on Patriotic Education of the same Society declares in its latest report:

"Every chapter should have a committee whose business it is to investigate conditions in the public schools of its locality and ascertain whether or not this sort of instruction is being indulged, the teachers encouraging it, and the extent to which it is carried on, in order that public sentiment may be aroused against it, and positive, definite proof obtained and submitted to the local school boards, looking to the prompt removal of such teachers."

The same quality of patriotism, put into effective operation in Chicago against an Anglicized Superintendent of Schools and the treason texts he had introduced, has called forth a cry of "Politics in the schools." What is needed everywhere is just such politics—patriotic, virile, American politics—active enough in the school boards to drive pro-British politics out of our school books, and out of our educational system.

President Nicholas Murray Butler and other Columbia paymasters of the Carnegie funds called a national conference of teachers of American history in Philadelphia, December 29, 1917. There Professor Henry Johnson of the History Department, Columbia Teachers' College, presented the following cut-and-dried statement, or platform, and much more to the same effect:

"The traditional and conventional attitude toward history as a school study has been accentuated and illustrated anew under the pressure of war.

"We must, as all of us know, win the war. To that supreme purpose every other consideration must be subordinated. Personal convictions, personal emotions, even the love for truth, must blend in one harmonious, overpowering, stern will to victory. What cannot be mended must for the moment be ended.

"Inevitably, therefore, the question uppermost in the minds of thousands of history teachers today and in the minds of other thousands who are not history teachers is, 'What can history do for Victory?'

"Inevitably, the first answers spring out of that wise human instinct which meets needs as they arise, without paralyzing scrutiny of the logic involved. . . .

"Attention is directed to the old charge that the study of the American Revolution in our schools tends to promote an anti-British state of mind.

"Observing further that this state of mind might conceivably hamper co-operation with our British ally, it is a natural reaction to demand revision of our text books with a view to the cultivation of a pro-British state of mind, and this reaction is now actually in evidence."¹

Professor Johnson is America's most eminent teacher of history teachers. Their subordination of mind, or at least of their utterance, to his authority is analogous to that of school children toward their teacher. There was not a word of protest uttered against this strange

¹ Congressional inquiry into this proceeding is reported in the Congressional Record, Oct. 22, 1918.

pronouncement, which had come, cut and dried, from the powers that dominate the teaching profession.

As the session was about to close, the chairman, Professor Marshall S. Brown, dean of the History Department of New York University, summed up as follows:

“The position taken by Professor Johnson, and perhaps suggested by one or two others, was that the past should be interpreted by the motive that induces the action of the present, rather than that present action be hindered by motives of the past. There seems to be no dissent from that position.

“Those two points, I thought, would meet with a great deal of discussion, and the fact that they have not seems to imply that we have reached a consensus of opinion on that proposition, and that the points advanced by Professor Johnson meet with our unanimous approval. The meeting stands adjourned.”

The real connection with the war lay in the fact that war-time feeling was taken advantage of to justify and advance and commit teachers as a body to the Anglicization of American school history, which had been started and was to be carried further. This Philadelphia pronouncement was promptly echoed in hundreds of resolutions, similar in spirit and similarly put through State and County Teachers' Association meetings all over the country. These resolutions were invariably introduced upon recognized authority which teachers cared not to resist. The deeper portent was not suspected. And given to resolutions which in tone and volume were so, without second thought, ready assent everywhere was

designed to create, and did create, the conviction that the history teachers of the entire country were unanimous in a demand for the Anglicization of American school histories.

This apparently universal demand, commercially pulling in front, emboldened the publishers of ten school texts to issue Anglicized editions, while other influences, pushing from behind, had inspired "Anglo-American professors of history" with zeal to do the revising. Superintendents and principals, with the same meek acquiescence they had given to the resolutions, readily accepted the Anglicized texts into thousands of public schools.

Another phase of submission to this hypnosis was the adoption of Anglicized courses of study into schools and Americanization classes. Such a course was adopted into the public schools of Newark, N. J., in August, 1918, with the following statement:

"Another object of this course is to produce a right attitude toward England. While an appreciative study of our English heritage will be of great aid in correcting previously formed misconceptions of England's place in history, the correct presentation of the Revolutionary War as a struggle of Englishmen in the New World for the same old ideas of justice and freedom, and of the sympathy of many English in the Old World with that struggle, will not be neglected by the earnest teacher.

"By touching strongly upon the century of peace

with England, accomplished by mutual friendliness and compromises, by arbitration treaties rather than by 'rattling the sword,' by inspiring admiration of the qualities that have made England great, by calling attention to aims held in common, to the mutual interchange of ideas through our common language, a correct attitude toward England cannot fail to be attained."

The superintendent, principal or teacher who might secretly realize doubt as to the loyalty and wisdom of all this strange innovation must have thought himself alone in his profession in entertaining doubt. To be out of line meant to lose professional standing and perhaps position. So any patriotic scruples were smothered in silence.

Owing to the amiable inattention of the American people to our most sacred trust, and owing to the spineless subserviency of our collegiate and public school systems to the insidious control of heavily capitalized and cunningly organized alien influences, the teachings of American history and Americanization in our public schools were being perverted against our national sovereignty and distorted to create sentiment for "the Re-United States, the British-American Union."

But exposure of this unprecedented conspiracy has warned and awakened the patriotic people of the nation.

A storm of protest is sweeping across the land, and superintendents, principals and teachers are being

aroused from their hypnotic spell, ceasing to goose-step to "God Save the King," and in the face of public indignation are discovering their own detestation of the treason texts. Americanism is again coming to be countenanced in our schools.

Our country's true history is the most valuable asset of our Nation and the richest heritage of our people.

It is ours from heroic fathers, in trust for our children. Recreant indeed are we to permit it to be polluted with alien propaganda in our public schools.

Yet the same demand that was made as result of war-time British propaganda in 1917, for "*revision of our text books with a view to the cultivation of a pro-British state of mind,*" is still being made by the American Historical Association, which seeks, through a \$1,000,000 "research," to find or to fabricate "facts" to sustain such revisions. This Association in its latest national meeting, at Washington, D. C., December 28, 1927, declared:

"The development of genuine, intelligent patriotism demands that the truth of history shall be taught, even though it may include unpleasant facts. Attempt to foster national boastfulness, arrogance and indiscriminate worship of national heroes only serves to promote false patriotism. Clearly implied charges that many of our leading scholars are engaged in treasonable propaganda and that tens of thousands of American school teachers and officials are so stupid and disloyal as to place treasonable text books

in the hands of children is inherently and obviously absurd."

This sounds indeed plausible, as they say it; but this aggregation of "Anglo-American professors of history" ought to have set forth their real attitude far more frankly and in fewer words, to the effect that anything pro-British is "truth of history" and cannot be treasonable, while anything which fosters American national spirit, devotion to American ideals and emulation of American loyalty "only serves to promote false patriotism."

For the line is strictly drawn. The American patriotic protest is against falsification of facts. The American patriotic demand is for preservation of the truth, to the end that our children and our children's children may have the same inspiration and guidance that have made us the pre-eminent people of the world. If this is what the Anglo-American professors call "national boastfulness," for which they would substitute laudation of Britain, the answer to them is that American boastfulness has as good right to be anywhere as British boastfulness, and far better right to be in our own school histories.

True American history has not only inspired, strengthened and guided us as a people to first place in esteem and prestige among the nations. It is lighting all mankind to "government of the people, by the peo-

ple and for the people," and rendering odious and intolerable throughout the world the scheming diplomacies and secret alliances which in the dark past have made grasping imperialisms secure; and it renders alike odious and intolerable the modern sinister methods of censorship and propaganda for the deception and disintegration of independent peoples.

What is meant by "truth in history" can be made clear, not in abstractions, but in tests of specific instances, which occur innumerable in the treason texts. A typical instance for examination is the treatment accorded to an outstanding Revolutionary patriot leader by several of the revisionists. Everett Barnes, 1920, teaches:

"John Hancock, a rich merchant of Boston, who at a later day was president of the Continental Congress and the first signer of the Declaration of Independence, was a smuggler; so had been his father."

No other mention of Hancock appears in that text book. This slurring "truth" is the only information given to school children by that author concerning this eminent character and important career.

When this and other Anglicized histories came under public attack, the first to appear in defense of them was Prof. Claude H. Van Tyne.² "There is nothing in any of these quotations that is actually untrue," said Prof. Van Tyne—"not even Barnes' dreadful assertion

² New York Times, Sept. 21, 1921.

that John Hancock was a smuggler and the son of a smuggler.³ Perhaps," Van Tyne qualified, as though gently chiding Brother Barnes, "there should be a little explanation of the colonial attitude toward smuggling, but there is no other word that just describes what John Hancock did. Indeed, he was proud of it and was rather looked up to for it."

The casual reader might naturally assume from this that Prof. Van Tyne in his own text book was doing real justice to John Hancock. But any assumption based on assertions of Van Tyne are apt to be misleading, as was so in this instance. John Hancock is mentioned four times in the McLaughlin and Van Tyne *History of the United States for Schools*, Revised, 1919, as follows:

"Smuggling was so common that even a leading Boston merchant is known as 'The Prince of Smugglers.'"—Page 140.

"A riot followed the seizure of John Hancock's sloop Liberty on a charge of smuggling."—Page 146.

"Gage sent out troops to seize the patriot leaders, Samuel Adams and John Hancock."

"As the British troops neared Lexington Adams and Hancock stole away across the fields."—Page 153.

³ Anyone assuming to write American history, excepting the "Anglo-American professors" of the "higher historical scholarship," would be expected to know that the Rev. John Hancock, father of John Hancock, was an eminent minister of the gospel, who died while John was a baby, long before the "smuggling" period began.

There is no other mention of John Hancock in the book. Not a word that his "smuggling" was open, patriotic defiance of the odious English Acts of Trade, which forbade the colonies to trade with the world, or even with one another, except in English ships. Not a word about his devotion, sacrifices and distinguished services to the patriot cause. Not a word about the fortune he contributed. Not a word that he was President of the Continental Congress which framed the Declaration of Independence and the first signer of that immortal document. Nothing of any of this for our children about John Hancock—no, no; they are taught only that this "patriot leader" was merely a smuggler and a sneak.

Most British histories, quite naturally, denounce Hancock bitterly, but in no decent British history is there utter failure to accord John Hancock recognition as a tremendous force for Revolution and Independence. It has remained for an "American" historical revisionist to surpass even the hostile versions in contemptuous presentation of this great patriot character.

Confidently submitted to any fair-minded American—yes, to any fair-minded persons, whether American or British in sympathies—is the simple, candid proposition that such representation of national heroes does not constitute honest history, that it is not designed to be accurate presentation of the truth, and that, taught in

the public schools, this sort of stuff must inevitably result in the deadening of pride and confidence in the characters and principles of our nation's founders, the poisoning of the springs of patriotism and the denaturing of national spirit and morale, in the next generation.

Thin shelter Professor Van Tyne sets up for himself and his fellow-revisionists in pleading that there is nothing that any of them have said "that is actually untrue." If it were so, which it is not, is this all that is required of history—that it be not "actually untrue"? Is no more expected of history than that it may barely cling at the brink of the pit of falsehood?

The historian presenting Jefferson to children as "deserving of a halter," and Hamilton as declaring that "the people are a great beast," cannot make it truth by sponsoring it with a nebulous somebody's say-so. Suppose somebody did say that Jefferson deserved a halter; it could have been said for no purpose but to vent enmity, to belittle his character and to weaken his influence; and its repetition in school history today can be to no other purpose.

To call this truth is to insult the sacred name. The spirit that prompts such a historian is false; the pictures he presents are false; the impression they produce is false. Who can have patience with defense of a possible grain of "truth" in a deliberately reared mountain of misrepresentation?

Even given the fact, truth is far more than mere assertion of bare fact. Fact is the rough stone that needs cutting, polishing and setting to sparkle with the light of truth. The selecting of facts, the joining of them and the coloring of them may shape them into form of angel or of demon, white or black. Mere omissions may invalidate truth. Exaggeration and minimization distort it. Constant coloring to suit an interested purpose perverts it. Fragment of fact, even if in itself indubitably true, is not alone truth for history.

The history that truthfully presents our nation's annals in such sympathetic, virile, patriotic spirit as to inculcate in our children pride in the birth and development of our republic, honor to its heroes, devotion to its principles and progress, and zest in its ideals and purposes—this is true history. But the history that creeps along the verge of falsehood, alien in spirit, snarling in self-defense that it is “not actually untrue,” and inoculating the children with suspicion of the nation's founders, doubt as to its cardinal principles, and indifference to its democratic ideals—that history is false.

The historic truths, principles, traditions, ideals and purposes which have been good enough to serve as inspiration and guidance to the American people through a century and a half of unprecedented achievement and to unparalleled prestige as a nation are good enough for us now. *None other is good enough*—particularly

none foisted upon us through alien propaganda and home-grown toadyism.

Unworthy sons of such fathers as ours are we, indeed, if we have not the spirit and strength to retain in ink what they wrote in their blood.

In our continued homage to our natal truths and principles and in our vigilant defense of them lie the best proof of our worthiness and the best promise of our security and the destiny of democracy throughout the world.

We can do honor to our fathers, credit to ourselves and justice to our children only by purging the public schools of the histories that are disloyal to American tradition, spirit and prestige.

Is it not a very strange thing, and without precedent in the affairs of nations, that Americans who revere our country's history and understand its great human values are now called upon to defend it from destruction? No people has ever before been obliged to protect its most sacred records, not from assault by invading armies, but from insidious and subtle attacks at home and from its own citizens acting under foreign influences and guidance.

VI.

NATION'S FRIENDS DEFAMED

*Chivalric Help Attributed to Mean Motives—
Heroes of All Races but English Ignored*

IN THESE tabloided and denatured accounts of the War of the Revolution is scarcely a principle, purpose or achievement set forth in a way to appeal to pride in our forefathers and the free nation they founded, not an incident that warms the blood of youth, not an example that stirs desire for emulation, nor an ideal that thrills to patriotic fervor. What of inspiring incident is not minimized or distorted is omitted.

Every nation that gave aid or recognition to the colonists was, according to these revisionists, actuated by mean, selfish motives. France assisted only after she saw that

"The American revolt was a weapon strong enough to use in taking revenge on England. . . . Spain joined England's enemies with the hope of regaining the island of Jamaica and the stronghold of Gibraltar; Holland, England's old commercial rival, came into the league for the destruction of Britain's naval power and the overthrow of her colonial empire.—Muzzey: *An American History*, Revised, 1920, p. 119.

Strictly in line with the common policy of Anglici-

zation of American history, West assails France for her aid to the colonists:

"To the despotic French Government the alliance was purely a 'League of Hatred.'"—p. 235.

"To large numbers of patriots even the news of the new ally was of doubtful cheer. Many began to fear that they had only exchanged the petty annoyances of English rule for the slavery of French despotism and of Spanish inquisition."—p. 236.

Everett Barnes, 1920, teaches:

"France wanted land in America; she wanted to regain some at least of what she had lost to England in the French and Indian War twenty years before."—p. 96.

McLaughlin and Van Tyne, 1919, teach that:

"French statesmen watched for a time when England should be weakened and France might avenge her shame and regain her power."—p. 175.

Even in the negotiations for peace, according to Muzey's teaching:

"It soon became evident to the American diplomats at Paris that France was planning to find consolation for her defeated ally, Spain, at the expense of her victorious ally, America,"—p. 127.

Thus the same shameless methods of falsification that are employed to tighten our bonds with England are persistently made use of to discredit and disintegrate our ties with France. Throughout the Anglicized school

histories France's aid in the Revolution is taught to the rising generation of Americans as one of selfish, scheming diplomacy, to be regarded with contempt, not gratitude, because it "was part of a conspiracy aimed against British power." The American Revolution, our children are being taught, was but an incident in a wide-spread coalition promoted by France against England.

Many of the Anglo-American professors play up the idea that:

"France caused Spain and Holland to declare war against England. Thus England was fighting against four nations."

Professor Muzzey stresses this and adds:

"Thus the American Revolution, after the victory at Saratoga, developed into a coalition of four powers against Great Britain, and the American continent became again, for the fifth time within a century, the ground on which France and England fought out their mighty duel:"—pp. 118-9.

The only conceivable design in all this is to reverse the odds and thus belittle the glorious triumph of the Revolutionists and at the same time to impugn their purposes and to befog the clean, always distinct fact that from first to last America was actuated in the conflict only by principles and conditions strictly her own.

Such alterations, distorting the purposes, confusing the principles and minimizing the achievements in the Revolution, may be very pleasant to British taste and

in harmony with most British versions, but they are grossly defamatory of our fathers, insulting to our own intelligence and deadening to national pride and patriotic spirit in our children.

Secret use of French spies and French money in the colonies and secret French aid in gunpowder, shot and shell, clothing and muskets are emphasized as shameful. The inevitable British view of these matters is scrupulously maintained, and the natural British invective against American motives and America's friends in the Revolution is impudently injected into American school histories.

If such had been the teaching in the past, would our two millions of young men have been in France in 1918? But for the ennobling and guiding inspirations that have flowed from our traditions of French aid in the Revolution, most of our subsequent history of helpfulness to other peoples must certainly have remained undone. The action of France in aiding the struggling colonists is one of the most generous and chivalrous incidents in world history. She gained nothing—nothing but our gratitude.

Even the British propagandists ten years ago were openly and heavily emphasizing America's immemorial debt of gratitude to France, while that appeal was serving Britain's purpose when General Haig was saying she had her "back against the wall."

These alterations regarding France were made for the most part in revisions of 1919 and 1920. That there was common direction back of them must be clearly manifest in their concert of alteration and their sameness of spirit. The definite purpose may only be inferred, perhaps, but it is plainly to be seen that no good American purpose is served.

A striking phase of all the Anglicized revisions is the elimination of German, Irish, Italian and Polish assistance in the Revolution, as well as that of the Dutch of New York and Pennsylvania, the French of Carolina, the Swedes of New Jersey and Delaware, and the Negroes in all the colonies.

Almost uniformly throughout his book Everett Barnes calls the colonists "Englishmen in America" and "Britons fighting for liberty"; and he, as well as West, Ward and McLaughlin and Van Tyne, class the Revolution as an English "civil war" waged between English political parties on both sides of the sea, "neighbor against neighbor."

Professor Hart in earlier editions had the frankness to say:

"Germans, Irish, Scotch-Irish, French, Dutch, Negroes and Englishmen stood side by side in the ranks."

But in his "Revised 1920" edition he magically trans-

formed so eminent a hero as Baron De Kalb from a German to a Frenchman:

“France shut her eyes when some gallant young French officers, especially Marquis De Lafayette and De Kalb, went to America as volunteers.”

Everett Barnes also declined to classify De Kalb as a German:

“Officers skillful in the art of war began coming to America to serve under Washington; Lafayette was one; so was De Kalb.”—*Short History*, p. 66.

Professor Guitteau is just as disingenuous:

“With Lafayette came the brave Baron de Kalb who fell covered with wounds at Camden.”—p. 187.

Professors McLaughlin and Van Tyne, less resourceful, simply omit Baron De Kalb.

With his never-failing artfulness, Everett Barnes successfully dodges also in the case of the German “drill master of the Revolution”:

“Among the skillful officers that had come from Europe to help the Americans was Baron von Steuben.”—*Grammar Grades*, 1920, p. 214.

Home-grown motives might be imagined for carrying back a century and a half the cancellation of friendly relations with Germans; but whence comes the motive for a sudden change in attitude toward Irish heroes of

the Revolution? It is not our own nation that has trouble with the Irish.

George Washington had a high regard for Irishmen, which was glowingly recognized by the early historians, but is not perpetuated in any one of the Anglicized revisions.

General Richard Montgomery, whom Washington placed in chief command of the Northern Army; General Henry Knox, who was the head of Washington's artillery; General Daniel Morgan, the leader of his infantry; General Stephen Moylan, commander of his cavalry; General Edward Hand, his adjutant general; John Sullivan, Anthony Wayne, John Stark, William Irvine, whom Washington made generals; Commodore John Barry, brilliant sea fighter and Washington's first head of the United States Navy—every one an Irishman—all fare sadly at the hands of these English-sympathizing revisers of history today.

Hart gives to Benedict Arnold sole credit for the attack on Quebec, with no mention at all of General Montgomery, who commanded and lost his life there.

General Knox's outstanding services throughout the Revolution are ignored by every one of the Anglicized revisionists, and the only mention of him by any of them is passing note of his being Secretary of War in President Washington's Cabinet.

Like neglect is accorded to Gen. Sullivan, who won the first victory on land for American Independence, was Washington's right hand man in the victory at Trenton, won at Quaker Hill what Lafayette pronounced "the best contested battle of the war," served with distinction on Long Island, on Staten Island, in Westchester, at Brandywine and at Germantown, and even when breaking in health led the expedition that drove the marauding Tories and Indians out of Western New York. Yet Muzzey and Everett Barnes seem never to have heard of Gen. Sullivan, and McLaughlin and Van Tyne, Hart and Guitteau refer to him only as leading the march against the Iroquois. Gen. Sullivan had special thanks from Washington and from Congress; in the old school histories his was one of the most resplendent and inspiring of records; but in the thickening mists of racial prejudice his fame is all but obscured.

Of Commodore Barry, who won the first and last and many intervening sea fights of the Revolution, gave one of the largest private fortunes in the colonies to the cause, snatched \$2,000,000 worth of sea prizes from the British for the patriots, and in the darkest days of struggle and sacrifice gave to patriotism and courage a quickening slogan in his scornful refusal of a British bribe, Hart has the grace to say only:

"The first officer placed in command of a squad-
was John Barry, an Irishman";

while Everett Barnes, Guitteau, and McLaughlin and Van Tyne erase his name entirely. Commodore Barry's portrait hangs in Independence Hall; his statue stands in the center of Independence Square and another close to the Capitol at Washington, inscribed to "The Father of the Navy of the United States," of which he was the highest-ranking officer under Washington, Adams and Jefferson; but these Anglicized historians would consign him to oblivion.

Captain Parker, who commanded the Minute Men at Lexington and died there; Captain Barrett, who commanded at Concord Bridge and directed the patriot chase of the British back to Boston; Sharpshooter Tim Murphy, who picked off the British General Fraser and saved a great day at Saratoga; Sergeant Jasper, who leaped upon the wall of Fort Moultrie in a rain of British fire and set up again the Stars and Stripes that had been shot down; the picturesque Molly Pitcher, General Reed, General Moylan, and General Irvine, who, with General Wayne, saved West Point after Arnold's treason—all of these illustrious Irish names that have thrilled and inspired the school boys and school girls of our land in the past have been incontinently wiped out of every one of the treason texts.

General Anthony Wayne gets barest mention by Hart, Guitteau and Muzzey and McLaughlin and Van Tyne, while Everett Barnes does not mention him at all.

General Morgan, though admitted by both Barnes and Guitteau to have crushed Tarleton and freed the South of the British and Tories, and also admitted by Barnes to have played a leading part in the capture of Burgoyne, is not mentioned by either of these elsewhere, nor at all by Hart or McLaughlin and Van Tyne.

Froude, the most malignant traducer that Ireland ever had, says that Irishmen were

"the foremost, the most irreconcilable, the most determined in pushing the American Revolution to the last extremity."

This was fitted to English ears. To traduce the Irish of the Revolution in American ears the only cue is silence.

Kosciusko and Pulaski, that noted pair of Polish noblemen who gave most gallant services in many a battle and one of whom gave his life at Savannah, have been wiped out of Anglicized school history. True, Muzzey groups bare mention of De Kalb, Steuben, Pulaski and Kosciusko in a foot-note.

It is unjust to the Irish, German, Polish and other racial heroes of the Revolution, unjust to their peoples of today, unjust to ourselves, unjust to our future generations, that all these resplendent names should be condemned to obloquy or oblivion in American history, because Great Britain feels need to cultivate American sympathy and support.

What of our independence, self-respect and national morale if we are thus to be colonized intellectually, emotionally, and politically as a dependency of Great Britain in her imperialistic purposes?

Now that we see how readily so many of the most illustrious names in Revolutionary annals have been dimmed or eliminated, simply because they are German or Irish, perhaps we may also judge correctly why other luminous names which have cast black shadows upon England's record and sorely offended her pride are also suppressed by these new hyphenate historians.

One of the best beloved figures in the old school histories was Nathan Hale. The original *Barnes' School History*, a favorite for fifty years, and still revised but not reversed, retains this:

"Captain Nathan Hale had been sent by Washington as a spy into the British camps on Long Island. He passed the lines safely but on his way back was recognized and arrested. Being taken to Howe's headquarters, he was tried and executed. No clergyman was allowed to visit him; even a Bible was denied him; and his farewell letters to his mother and sister were destroyed. His last words were, 'I regret that I have but one life to lose for my country.'"

But McLaughlin and Van Tyne have no single word of Nathan Hale, nor has Guitteau, or O'Hara, or Ward, or Everett Barnes, or West, or Muzzey. In only one of

ten Anglicized school histories does the name of Nathan Hale occur, and there Hart only lists him among "distinguished graduates of Yale," with no hint as to why he is distinguished.

And while these revisionists have no resentment against or even mention of this British execution of an American spy, they all fully and feelingly recite the brave exploit and American execution of the British spy, Major Andre. In these histories that altogether give less than one-fourth of one line to Nathan Hale, and that not to the point, there are more than forty lines devoted to "the British agent who was hanged as a spy."

For whose benefit is the hanging of Nathan Hale by the British suppressed and the hanging of Andre by the Americans emphasized?

The most bitterly-hated by the British of all the great patriot leaders, and upon whose head King George set a price, was the President of the Continental Congress and first signer of the Declaration of Independence. So John Hancock gets scant and shabby treatment in the Anglicized school histories, some of them making no mention whatever of him except as a "smuggler." To serve what interest?

The ignominy accorded Nathan Hale and John Hancock is fairly typical of the elimination or the defamation of innumerable once-outstanding patriot names that

had been symbols at once of American heroism and of British tyranny and cruelty. Why?

With significant spontaneity, and for what reason one may readily guess, more than a score of names of Irish heroes of the Revolution, and every German name, that for a century and a half had inspired the youth of our land and incited American sympathy for Ireland, and appreciation of Germany, suddenly disappeared from the pages of American school history, revised. In whose interest but Britain's was this accomplished?

Clearly, here is definite purpose to exalt Britain, while discrediting other nations, and even our own, in the minds of American school children.

Through the Nordic complex, even Christopher Columbus is slurred, and the vague myths of earlier discoveries by Norsemen are given semblance of proved reality, for no discernible reason but that there shall be no recognition of any contribution whatever from the Latin races in the making of America.

Most of the Anglicized historians thought it sufficient simply to omit such famous slogans as "We have met the enemy and they are ours," "Don't give up the ship," and "I've not yet begun to fight." But McLaughlin and Van Tyne definitely seek to destroy these inspiring slogans by disputing their authenticity.

Of Lawrence's last brave words this pair of vandals say:

“‘Fight the ship until she is sunk,’ seems to have been his real words, and the others are the words of the boy who took his message on deck.”—Page 265.

“Don’t give up the ship” was accepted at the time and forty years after, when Commodore Perry put the words on his flag at the Battle of Lake Erie. “Anglo-American professors of history,” to get a new message a century later, must trust to clairvoyance, or something even less reliable.

Of Ethan Allen’s demand upon the British commander of Ticonderoga to surrender “in the name of the Great Jehovah and the Continental Congress, by God!” these vandals remark:

“So Allen afterward declared. He had no right to demand the fort in the name of the Continental Congress, for his commission was from Connecticut.”

Any victory over the British was, in the minds of these authors, a breach of etiquette, not to be mentioned without apology.

Not one word of the sublime courage of the devoted little band of patriots that held their ground against three charges of 3,000 British regulars at Bunker Hill, until — so these authors say — “*British pluck triumphed!*”

Students of the old histories used to be familiar with General Howe’s offer to Commodore Barry of \$100,000

and command of a British squadron if he would desert the American cause, and Barry's scornful reply:

"I have devoted myself to the cause of my country, and not the command or the value of the whole British navy could seduce me from it."

The old *Barnes' Primary History*, a public school favorite for many years, gave the following typical old-time account of British attempts to bribe the starving patriots in the dark days of the Revolution:

"The British tried to bribe American generals to betray their country. They offered General Joseph Reed \$50,000 if he would forsake his country's cause, and General Reed sent back the noble answer, 'I am not worth purchasing, but such as I am the King of Great Britain is not rich enough to buy me.' British agents went among Washington's starving men at Valley Forge and offered them good pay and plenty of food and clothes if they would desert, but none of them would listen to the shameful proposal."

Naturally, all such accounts are carefully eliminated from the hyphenate revisions. Of tenor quite to the contrary, the new Barnes—the Everett Barnes, 1920, gives this version:

"People in New Jersey were giving up to the king; men by the hundreds were deserting Washington's army."

"Nearly three thousand colonists," says the Anglicized Guitteau, 1920,

“grasped eagerly at General Howe’s offer of a free pardon to all who would take the oath of allegiance to the king.”

West says that a third of Washington’s men at Valley Forge deserted and joined the British in Philadelphia. He got this out of the writings of Joseph Galloway, a violent Tory, who was driven out of this country, but whose letters, unearthed through “modern scientific research,” are now favorite “source material” for Tory authors of treason texts.

Nothing in these histories any more about the men who *stayed* at Valley Forge, of their sublime devotion, of the hardships they bravely endured, of their tramping the snow with their bloody feet, and of Washington kneeling to the God of battle.

VII.

“THE RE-UNITED STATES”

*British-American Union the Declared Design
of Carnegie and the Object of His Foundation*

THE sinister alterations made in a half-score of our school histories, by which our annals are perverted, our heroic fathers are defamed and their ideals and achievements, upon which our Republic was established, are grossly distorted to the children in the public schools of the nation, obviously could not have occurred by chance coincidence.

Indeed, clearly-defined motive, definitely-stated designs and carefully-planned, heavily-financed and widely-spread organizations to this end are overwhelmingly in evidence.

This alien project was on long before the war, but the war gave it extraordinary opportunity and impetus. Under the exigencies of war, governments conscripted public opinion as they conscripted men and materials. They mobilized it, dressed it in uniform, strictly dieted it on alliance propaganda, put it in charge of drill sergeants, goose-stepped it and taught it to stand at attention and salute.

This was a war measure, and it helped to win the war. But the war has long been over, and everything has been

demobilized but the Anglo-American propagandists. These are still goose-stepping, no longer under our own government service, but under international drill masters, political, financial and scholastic.

As everybody knows, the most potent and all-pervasive influence in the college, school and library systems of the United States today is the Carnegie Foundation, the sustaining fund of which, invested in United States Steel Corporation bonds, has now grown to more than \$300,000,000 value.

To this exhaustless fund and the multiform influence it exerts through countless active agencies American colleges look not only for endowments but for selection of their presidents and faculty, and professors look for honorary degrees, promotions and pensions.

Libraries look to this foundation for branch buildings, donations of books for their "international alcoves" and, most vital of all, the training and selection of their librarians.

School superintendents and teachers look to it for preferments and perquisites.

Publishers look to it for heavy patronage.

Historians look to it for funds for historical research, the results of which they accept as authoritative.

Authors have for years until lately accepted of it free quarters in New York for the Authors' Club.

Various church federations are largely supported by it in preaching the gospel of internationalism.

Most of the pacifist societies thrive upon it.

It is the life-blood of the active Anglo-American propaganda organizations.

The subtle workings of this fund have become the most powerful influence in the American scholastic system.

Manifestly, a machine so strong, extensive, intricate and smoothly-working as this, turning out more than \$27,000,000 a year into the channels named, must have tremendous motive power. Obviously it is a product not of skillful planning alone but of definite and soul-deep purpose.

What is the motive power of this vast machine? What was Carnegie's purpose?

No guessing is called for. Carnegie himself has unequivocally stated his philosophy and his soul-deep purpose. With his heart in Britain and his fortune in America, his greatest longing was for British-American union, and he made no secret of it.

Andrew Carnegie, while heavily endowing educational foundations in this country and proclaiming that his fondest dream was of "the Re-United States, the British-American Union," was not at all unmindful of the potent influence of history teachings in the cultiva-

tion of patriotic citizenship. He wrote, in "*Triumphant Democracy*," page 530:

"The conquering Briton has conquered more and more easily, as he has had behind him more and more of a record of achievements of his race. What the British boy grows to be as a citizen largely depends upon how he is fashioned by knowing and dwelling upon the history of his country's triumphs and of its leaders in the past."

This much Mr. Carnegie says positively. No one disputes or doubts that the British Empire strides securely forward because of the staunch national spirit that is due to its patriotic history.

And then Carnegie significantly questions:

"What would the American boy become as a citizen if he had not his Washington and other Revolutionary heroes to inspire him and cause the blood to tingle in his veins as he reads the story of his country's struggle for independence?"

What, indeed, would he become? The answer is not yet seen, for the experiment was only recently begun. Will a warned and awakened American people permit it to proceed?

A vital and congenial part of the training of American youth has indeed been in patriotic education. American patriotism in its purity not only naturally and powerfully appeals to youth; it is an essential part of the equipment for democratic citizenship. To all genera-

tions since the formation of our Republic, the true history of the heroisms, sacrifices, ideals, principles and purposes of the founders has moulded our character as a people and determined our national destiny. Andrew Carnegie stated well the power of patriotic education, and he stated well what the lack of it would mean.

What were his conscious motives in endowing the vast foundation for the control of colleges, public school and public library systems of the country that had yielded him his fortune, we may not know; but we do know that he was born a Briton, died a Briton and was a loyal Briton all his life, for he said so; and we also know that his fondest dream was of "the Re-United States, the British-American Union," for these are his own words.

We hear "Anglo-American professors of history" pretending to pooh-pooh the suggestion that any sane mind ever thought of any such thing as British-American union. They better ponder the words of Carnegie in his book, "*Triumphant Democracy*," edition of 1893, beginning at page 520:

"Briton and American, now being fully agreed that those who made the attempt to tax the colonists without their consent were wrong, and that, in resisting this, the colonists vindicated their rights as British citizens, and therefore only did their duty, the question arises: Is a separation thus forced upon one of the parties, and now thus deeply regretted by the other, to be permanent?"

"I cannot think so, and I crave permission to adduce some considerations in support of my belief that the future is certainly to see a reunion of the separated parts and once again a common citizenship."

Carnegie, with the innate canniness of a great money-maker through special privilege, has proceeded directly to the heart of the matter, which is the vast financial and commercial advantage to Britain in reunion. He continues:

"A British-American reunion brings free entry here of all British products, as a matter of course. The richest market in the world is opened to Britain by a stroke of the pen. . . .

"Coal, iron, steel and all kinds of merchandise from Britain reach Atlantic ports more cheaply than American manufactures produced within a hundred miles of these ports. . . . To the whole Pacific Coast Britain is so much nearer in cost as to give her, under reunion, complete command of that market.

"In the event of reunion the American manufacturers would supply the interior of the country, but the great populations skirting the Atlantic seaboard and the Pacific Coast would receive their manufactured articles from Britain.

"There can be little question that nothing would so certainly ensure the permanent prosperity of Britain as free access to the American market, which can be effected so easily, and only through reunion, which would also bring with it enhanced value to land as the result of prosperity in all branches of British trade and industry. . . .

"It is not going too far to say that every kind of property in the sceptered isle and its every business interest would be permanently doubled in value by reunion. . . .

"I do not shut my eyes to the fact that reunion, insuring free entrance of British products, would cause serious disturbance to many manufacturing interests near the Atlantic Coast, which have been built up under the protective system. . . . There would be some opposition, of course, from those pecuniarily interested; but no private interests, or interests of a class, or of a section of what would then be our common country, would or should be allowed to obstruct a consummation so devoutly to be wished.

"If the question be judged in Britain by the material benefits certain to flow from it, never in all her history was such enormous material gain within her reach; and never as much as now has the future position of Britain so urgently required just such an assurance of continued prosperity. . . .

"This is precisely what reunion offers Britain—the most valuable and the most rapidly increasing market in the world for her manufactures, and the richest soil for cheap production of the food she requires.

"Reunion restores to her ownership the hundreds of millions of acres of fresh, fertile soil, the like of which is elsewhere unknown, and reopens a market for her manufactures sufficient even today to absorb all her surplus.

"Reunion will further benefit the United Kingdom in regard to debt and taxation. . . . When the union is restored it will be upon the basis of unit-

ing also the national debts as they stand, and making all a common obligation of the union, so that the United Kingdom would be relieved at once of the greater portion of its national debt, and of at least one-half of all its present heavy taxation, even if no reduction of expenditures resulted from having one general government, one army and navy, instead of two.

"The only course for Britain seems to be reunion with her giant child, or sure decline to a secondary place, and then to a comparative insignificance in the future annals of the English-speaking race, which is to increase so rapidly in America. . . .

"Let men say what they will, therefore, I say that as sure as the sun in the heaven once shone on Britons and Americans united, so surely is it one morning to rise, shine upon and greet again the Re-United States, the British-American Union."

Here is no maudlin sentimentality about mere amity.

The material advantages in reunion for Britain and for the international bankers heavily loaded with her obligations have vastly multiplied since Carnegie wrote this in 1893.

Britain's debt, which we would share in reunion, has stupendously increased. Her debt to us alone, which would be cancelled, runs into billions. Her taxation, which we would have to shoulder, is appalling.

If Britain, in 1893, had much to gain by "reunion with her giant child," as Carnegie said, she has immeasurably more to gain today.

Andrew Carnegie was no idle dreamer of vain dreams. None knew better than he the power of money and organization to turn men to puppets and to curdle the milk of patriotism for American children in the public schools.

A very wise man once believed that if one were permitted to make all the ballads of a people it would not matter who made their laws.

The modern propaganda theory is that if there can be direct control of the educational agencies of a people it cannot matter who makes their ballads even or their laws.

Most sycophantic, eager and persistent of the Carnegie propaganda agents are the Anglo-American college presidents and professors, who look to England for scholastic guidance and degrees and lean upon the Carnegie and allied foundations for endowments, promotions, annuities, perquisites and pensions.

The \$10,000 annuity granted under Carnegie's will to the present Chief Justice of the United States may be harmless against a Gibraltar rock of personal integrity. But when we consider that more than a million dollars are now paid every year to former Harvard professors alone in Carnegie pensions and annuities, and proportionate amounts are distributed in all our universities, who can help wondering how far this has contributed toward the Anglicization of our whole scholastic system?

Deriving their inspiration from the Carnegie ideal and their sustenance from the Carnegie Foundation, numerous ecclesiastical and pacifist organizations have grown up among us to disseminate, as divinely-inspired gospel, the doctrines of American disarmament and British-American coalition.

Such are the seductive methods and power of organized and endowed propaganda promotion today that well-meaning men, impractical in larger world affairs, are made blindly to accept and zealously to exploit as religious policies and "major moral issues" sinister schemes that are cunningly framed and foisted upon them by foreign politicians.

Propaganda is worked the more effectively through unsuspecting dupes, because through them it flows out with the force of sincere conviction.

The chiefly proclaimed purpose of the World Alliance and the Church Peace Union, founded on a \$2,000,000 Carnegie endowment, is to arrange and finance pulpit exchanges of British and American preachers. It is not fair exchange, since the American preachers selected to go to England, as well as the British preachers sent here, preach alike the gospel of British-American coalition. Our exchanged preachers come back trained adepts in organization of the churches as channels of British propaganda.

A "Church Union" movement, originating in England and lustily advocated by the pro-British in this country, was in vogue during the war and for a year or two after. The churches of the English-speaking world were to be gathered into a compact flock, of which the Church of England was to be the bell-wether. This ambitious enterprise has failed as yet to materialize in form, but it is being largely realized in substance. American church people of many creeds are having their political opinions dictated from Canterbury Cathedral, whose Lord Archbishop is president of the World Alliance.

By their own trusted leaders the people of American churches are having forced upon them as religious doctrines foreign political designs which would result in business calamity for our Middle and Pacific States and in a shameful sacrifice of our nation's traditional policy of independence and non-entanglement, which policy enlightened and loyal Americans are determined to maintain. The real "major moral issue" for Americans, and for the whole world, is the preservation of traditional Americanism, in principle and practice.

Any patriot of our country can only admire Carnegie's undivided loyalty to his own nation, and wish that all Americans, especially those supposed to be the more scholarly and influential, might emulate that virtue, and none be enticed by the alien lure that he so shrewdly designed and so temptingly gilded.

VIII.

LOYALIST PUBLIC LIBRARIES

Their Study Course Guidance Commends Pro-British Books and Disparages Americanism

“**T**HE AMERICAN REVOLUTION” by Prof. Claude H. Van Tyne is one of the volumes of “The American Nation” series, edited by Prof. Albert Bushnell Hart. Both Van Tyne and Hart are fervently recommended in the bulletins of the American Library Association as highest authorities on the American Revolution.

The opening sentence of the Editor’s Introduction by Prof. Hart reads thus:

“No more difficult task can be found in the 26 volumes of *The American Nation*’ than to write a fresh and original account of the American Revolution.”

“A fresh and original account!”—as though it were a lyric or a novel! Prof. Van Tyne’s own first sentence, Chapter 1, reads thus:

“Not a clause in the Declaration of Independence sets forth the real and underlying cause of the American Revolution.”

Professor Van Tyne reveals his attitude as that of a British advocate against the colonists. “It was of no use

to plead that Parliament had never taxed the colonists before," he writes:

"for as Dr. Johnson wrote, 'We do not put a calf into the plough; we wait 'till it is an ox.' The colonies were strong enough to stand taxation now, and the only reasonable dispute must be as to the manner of it."—Page 11.

"The majority and better class of colonists, those of education, culture, property, conservatism and high social position, were loyalist adherents to Britain," says Van Tyne, in contrast with the "noisy, blustering, bel-lowing patriots."—Page 34.

"The patriot had a covetous eye on the loyalists' property from the first."—Page 267.

As president of the Continental Congress,

"the outlawed John Hancock was placed in the chair by the influence of Samuel Adams who saw in the wealthy merchant's silks and velvets and splendid coach a foil for his own poverty."—Page 39.

"Adams' enemies said that he had duped Hancock, whose brains were shallow and pockets deep, into embracing the Revolutionary cause. A man of wealth and social position seemed to give the lie to the Tory sneer that the Whigs (patriots) were obscure, pettifogging attorneys, smugglers and bankrupt shop-keepers."—Page 40.

Thomas Jefferson was:

"full of rebellious spirit, generalization and declamation, which got him an honorable position on a British list of American traitors."—Page 82.

Lafayette and his officers are presented as the

“frog-eating gentry capering through America, taking snuff and bowing thirteen times before their mirrors.”—Page 226.

The book abounds with Tory utterances, not always put in quotation marks; while many opinions purported to be quoted strangely fit to Van Tyne’s own line of thought and style of expression.

In sharp contrast to the defamation of patriot leaders come apologies for the treason of Benedict Arnold. Here is one in whom Van Tyne finds no fault, for it was:

“a series of slights and insults which finally undermined his patriotism.”—Page 161.

The multiform Carnegie Fund influences, powerful in library and school circles, are actively working to establish Professor Van Tyne as the leading authority on the American Revolution. Praises of his books are sung by the full chorus of scholastic endowees, annuitants, pensioners and sycophants.

In the new Clements Library at the University of Michigan where Prof. Van Tyne heads the history department, the Carnegie Foundation has deposited what is said to be the largest collection of American history source material in the world. It has been collected by the Carnegie Research bureau, with Carnegie purposes always in view. In the recent dedication of this Carne-

gie collection Dr. John Franklin Jameson, director of the Carnegie Research, made the chief address and in it is this sneering but significant comment:

“The chief manifestation of public interest in history comes in the form of a passionate insistence, in newspaper articles, in harangues before school boards and in conventions of patriotic societies, that the innocent souls of school children shall not be poisoned by any suggestion tending toward fairness of mind in respect to the Revolution. It is, it seems, a necessity of patriotism that the sacred, one-sided traditions of elder days shall never be modified by any subsequent additions of knowledge.”

“Additions of knowledge,” indeed! Modified by subsequent subtractions of knowledge would better express the new writings of such as the Tory Van Tyne and the rest of the “Anglo-American professors of history,” whose books are being installed and exploited in the public libraries of our land.

Appreciation of our heritage as a free people, our patriotic spirit and the permanence of our liberties and unparalleled progress depend upon the purity of the records of our nation’s birth and mission as perpetuated in the public schools and public libraries. Intellectual subjugation is the menace of today, and nationwide assertion of intellectual independence is the only answer of an enlightened people worthy to continue free. Anglicized American histories, pretentious volumes that from cover to cover are a black sacrilege of

the sacred traditions and proud records of this republic, are being circulated from public libraries throughout the nation. American students, as well as our increasing thousands of naturalized citizens, seeking enlightenment on our historical accomplishments and national ideals, are being instructed through Anglicized authorities to consider, for instance, the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812 as huge American blunders, inspired by a few "soreheads" and "hard-headed" politicians looking for personal gain; to regard the battles during these periods as wretched skirmishes against inferior British forces, and to believe that such immortals as Alexander Hamilton, Samuel Adams, Thomas Jefferson, John Hancock and George Washington were men of vicious faults and habits, whose deeds have been regrettably "over-advertised."

On the other hand, these same "historians" lose no opportunity to laud England, English officers, English statesmen, English bravery, virtues and achievements; losing no chance to tell their readers, either with amazing candor or by insidious innuendo, how greatly to be admired is the Briton as compared with his over-weaning provincial "cousin." Historians, such as Albert Bushnell Hart, David Saville Muzzey and Claude H. Van Tyne have reconstructed the American classics of Fiske, Bancroft and Swinton to suit their propaganda-spreading ideas until scarcely anything remains of long-consecrated facts of American history but the title; **we**

have an insipid thing of cover and pages denatured of all patriotic incident.

In thousands of public libraries of the nation these Anglicized volumes are being recommended as standard American histories. In more than one hundred public libraries in our country is established "The International Alcove," sustained by Carnegie endowment, wherein books that are designed to cultivate the "international mind" and devitalize American national spirit have sanctuary.

Helen Nicolay's *Book of American Wars*, which has long been severely criticised as a grossly Anglicized misrepresentation of American heroic characters and events, has been thrown out of the Boston Public Library.

American history as written by Miss Nicolay reads thus:

"Samuel Adams, of Massachusetts, with his constantly nodding head, his red cloak and his tie wig, was so 'morally incorruptible' and had displayed such 'conspicuous ineptitude for trade' that his wife was forced to practice all sorts of economies to keep the household clothed and fed."

Miss Nicolay pictures another leading patriot as follows:

"James Otis, that 'great incendiary of New England,' had been foolish enough to resign a fine position as advocate general, because, forsooth, he felt

himself too good to argue in favor of writs of assistance."

Another revered patriot leader is characterized thus:

"As for Patrick Henry, who was pouring incendiary eloquence upon the Virginia Assembly . . . he was a slovenly, fiddle-playing incompetent, with an odd gift of oratory, who had been slow at his studies and had failed twice at clerking and once as a farmer before he decided to practice law. This he had the assurance to do after a paltry six weeks of preparation."

No Anglicized history of America is complete without venomous defamation of the first signer of the Declaration of Independence, and the Nicolay book is not lacking in this. There is this slur:

"They went far when they elected John Hancock, the man with a halter around his neck."

Such characterizations of patriot leaders of the American Revolution are strictly in accord with the hostile versions of their foes, as preserved in British history and Tory writings, and which have become odiously familiar through the exposures of Anglicized school histories.

Another Library book of Professor C. H. Van Tyne's is *The Causes of the War of Independence*. Of the American colonists Professor Van Tyne says in this book:

"In general, they were merely narrow-minded, provincial politicians, watching with Argus eyes the petty interests which, after all, were their own."—P. 53.

"They clamored for the *rights* of Englishmen, but were unconcerned about their *duties*."—P. 73.

Concerning the courage of the colonists in successfully resisting British oppression and power, Professor Van Tyne says:

"The valor which colonists exerted was for their own protection, and in the French and Indian War, at least, was lukewarm even when their frontiers were being drenched with blood."—P. 78.

The intolerable acts of tyranny specifically stated by the fathers in the Declaration of Independence as their causes for revolution are entirely set aside by Professor Van Tyne:

"In considering the immediate causes of the American War for Independence, in the period of 1763-1775, it will be seen that trouble was brewed not at all because of any cruel tyranny on the part of George III and his ministers."—P. 107.

Of those earlier martyrs to American liberty who were slain in the Boston Massacre, Professor Van Tyne says:

"Historical scholars of distinction have not hesitated to say that some of the rioters 'died as the fool dieth,' and that to make heroes of these undesirable

citizens was to put the martyr's crown on the brow of vulgar ruffians."—P. 289.

Patrick Henry is pictured by Van Tyne thus:

"A leader was vouchsafed them in the obscure young lawyer, Patrick Henry."—P. 149.

"In a highly cultured community, an honorable lawyer, influenced by the highest standards of the bar and wishing an honest legal basis for his argument, could hardly have taken the case at all. (The Parsons' Cause) . . . Unfortunately for Henry's reputation, it was not the only time in his life that he was on the side of injustice and made it prevail."—P. 153.

A new version of Patrick Henry's liberty-or-death speech is produced by Van Tyne, in which the fiery orator, instead of answering with defiance the cry of "Treason!" is said to have backed down and apologized. Van Tyne innocently admits in a foot-note that this new version has been unearthed by the Carnegie Institution.

"Patrick Henry's stump oratory" is classed with "Thomas Jefferson's amateur philosophy."

Washington does not escape impugnement of motive:

"By royal decree, moreover, the hopes of George Washington, and many other land speculators not so destined to immortality, were blighted."—P. 407.

Samuel Adams is slandered:

"Samuel Adams was looked upon as thriftless. As a tax collector he was accused of defalcation."

While Van Tyne finds little glory for America in the Revolution, he finds much for Britain:

"It will then appear that the American Revolution was one of the glories of British history rather than a blot upon her fair political record."—P. 456.

Into the closing sentence of the book is packed the substance of the whole:

"The British Empire was doomed to be broken asunder, but it was brought to that disaster by the insistent demand of Englishmen in America for the full enjoyment of those liberties which England has fostered beyond any other country of the world."

National Ideals Historically Traced, by Professor A. B. Hart, is another of the same vicious sort. As to the purpose of alterations and perversions of long-accepted facts in American history, Professor Hart says in his preface:

"To understand the course which we now steer we must rechart the beginnings and the progress of the voyage."

Conforming to the new Carnegie-set course toward "the Re-United States, the British-American Union," Professor Hart recharts such established and sacred landmarks in American history as the Revolution and other vitally important events, as follows:

"The crisis of 1775 showed that Americans could fight better than they could keep the peace, for the

Revolution was essentially organized disorder.”—P. 323.

“In origin the Revolution was not so much a war between the colonists and England as between two groups of colonists, one of which was supported by England.”—P. 323.

Professor Hart discloses that his own mind is not clear regarding the ideals he has presumed to trace and rechart. He says:

“In view of the rapid changes of the last thirty years it is hard to say precisely what are the present theories of American government.”—P. 113.

If such books as his are to prevail there must soon come utter confusion as to American theories, principles and policies. For American spirit and ideals Professor Hart shows contemptuous dislike. He quotes John Cotton as speaking of Democracy as

“the meanest and worst of all forms of government.”

“The Constitution,” says Professor Hart,

“was far from being what Gladstone thought it, ‘the greatest work ever struck off at any one time by the brain and purpose of man.’ . . . The Constitution contained almost no novelty.”

These are only samples of many such books welcomed generally in the public libraries of the land; and these are pointed out especially only for the reason that here and there public library boards have been

alert and patriotic enough to throw them out. A notable instance was the exclusion of the books of both Hart and Van Tyne from the public library of San Jose, Cal., because of their vicious qualities.

Rapidly increasing is this flock of historical and biographical buzzards, circling in "higher scholarship," acutely scenting afar the stench of slanders a century and a half dead, and touching earth only to feast foully upon the personal faults of great American leaders and the minor mistakes in great American measures.

The public library is the college of the adult. It is the ready recourse of the student making special research for truth. Like the public school, it is maintained by the people for the cultivation of enlightened, useful and loyal citizenship. Unlike the public school, it is not limited in the scope of study it can offer. Here freedom of the press has sacred sanctuary, that all views on all subjects may be available.

All this is true in theory but not all is true in practice.

Carnegie endowments, though covering but a small fraction of the cost of the public libraries, have secured for the Foundation large control over the policies of their management and all but complete control over training schools for librarians. Through this control such books as Van Tyne's are purchased and recommended by the public libraries, and their authors are exalted

as authorities; while, on the other hand, the histories that are loyal to American tradition and established truth are rejected or discredited and their authors unrecognized or disparaged in these same tax-sustained institutions.

Volume 1, No. 4, of the serial publication, "*Adult Education and the Library*," issued quarterly by the American Library Association and devoted to advice in "Reading Courses," recommends (p. 27):

"Davies, W. Watkins: '*How to Read History*,' with a chapter on American History, by Edwin W. Pahlow, Doran. 1924. 259 p."

Page 245 of Davies' book presents the following advice:

"Most of the old accounts of the movement toward revolution are biased; for example, Bancroft's '*History of the United States*,' a work on the colonial and revolutionary periods, for a long time widely read but now known better by title than by content. In it our democratic virtues are glorified, in the rhetorical manner characteristic of the Jacksonian period in which Bancroft began to write. The writings of the present-day school are fairer, notably those of Channing, Van Tyne and Becker. But, perhaps, the American reader will be more interested in hearing the case presented from the English point of view."

"*Adult Education, a Short List of References*," issued by the American Library Association and distributed

through the public libraries, commends twenty-six books, six of which are published by His Majesty's Stationery Office, London; four by the Oxford University Press, London; five by Macmillan, London and New York; and others by Longmans, London; Cambridge University Press, Columbia University Press, Holt, Harcourt and Doran. The American representation is as thin in quality as in quantity.

How relentlessly the simplest laws of economics work none ever knew better than Andrew Carnegie. The public libraries of the country in themselves provide a purchasing market that insures a safe profit for the publication of any book they accept. On the other hand, the rejection of any book by the public library system is apt to render its publication a financial loss. So, by the simplest law of business, the new books that are bought by the libraries, exalting Britain and degrading America, naturally multiply and are fast becoming predominant; while the new books that are loyal to truth and to American spirit steadily diminish and are disappearing; for the average book publisher is moved not by sentiment but by chance of profit.

Through the brochures regularly issued by the American Library Association and distributed through all public libraries, wherein pro-British books are highly recommended, while books maintaining the American

viewpoint are scarcely mentioned, there operates an effective censorship of the deadliest sort.

Not only is the mind of the reading public and of history students thus misdirected into the ever-widening channel of pro-British propaganda; but the whole book-publishing business of the United States, as far as it bears on Anglo-American relations is, by the law of publishers' profit and loss, increasingly and inflexibly controlled and directed into the pro-British line of publications.

It cannot be conceived that the personnel of the public library system of America are conscious of disloyal attitude. They do not read the books they mechanically recommend. They are products of their training, victims of the environment created about them, mere cogs in a vast, systematized machine, set up by pro-British hands, oiled with pro-British funds, and motivated by pro-British interests.

The American people can assert control over the public libraries. Shall this control be in the interest of an enlightened and loyal American citizenship, or in the interest of a cajoled and deceived allegiance to a foreign imperialistic power?

IX.

ENGLISH-SPEAKING UNION

*Its Organizers and Directors Are Most Active
In Making Our School Histories Imperialistic*

THE English-Speaking Union, headquartered in London, and having a "sister society" with branches in leading cities all over our land, has as its stated purpose:

"Believing that the peace of the world and the progress of mankind can be largely helped by the unity in purpose of the English-speaking democracies, we pledge ourselves to promote by every means in our power a good understanding between the peoples of the United States of America and the British Commonwealth."

Sounds sweet and innocent, doesn't it?

But how does the thing work out?

In a recent annual meeting of the English-Speaking Union at the Hotel Astor, New York, the chief guest of honor and principal speaker was Professor William Allan Neilson, president of Smith College. Professor Neilson is British-born, and Smith College is a beneficiary of the Carnegie Foundation. Among others present were the Hon. John W. Davis, Sir John and Lady Wimble, Sir Percy Fitzpatrick, Sir Eustace Fien-

nes, Baronet, etc. Professor Neilson, approving the progress that had been made in Anglicizing our school histories, and then deploring that patriotic protest was checking this progress, said in part:

“Following the World War, the bias in our histories had begun to pass away. Scholars in all our English-speaking countries were rising steadily above their partisan and narrowly patriotic sympathies, and especially in the United States the evidence of this progress was very clear. The histories studied in this country were getting better and better. But the fact must be faced that of late this progress has been checked. There has set in a wave of reaction in almost every State of the Union.

“The scholars of this country ask, and all they need is to be let alone; and our watchword in our activity is to leave the writing and teaching of history to the scholars and demand that the politicians keep their hands off.”

This reference obviously was only to American politicians, since the British politicians present all warmly applauded.

Our great American Patriotic Organizations, which had combined as a unit to drive the British propaganda histories out of the public schools, were anathematized by Professor Neilson before the English-Speaking Union as follows, amid applause:

“They are forces moved by men with a narrow political outlook and utterly devoid of scholarship, and it is preposterous that the intelligent people of

the country should sit passive while loud-mouthed and ignorant persons proceed once more to poison the mind of the rising generation."

Later it will be seen that such contemptuous estimate of American patriotism is fully endorsed by the *Landmark*, of London, official organ of the English-Speaking Union.

Such has become the attitude and form of utterance also of the American Historical Association, dominated by "Anglo-American professors of history," mostly officials and members in the English-Speaking Union or allied pro-British agencies, and which association now has its itching hand extended for a \$1,000,000 "research fund" for further unearthing of long-buried and decayed British and Tory falsehoods regarding America. Funds for this purpose are readily forthcoming, and as the funds flow in the Association becomes more and more voluble in denunciation of American patriotism, past and present.

In the last ten years the English-Speaking Union has been conducting, regardless of expenses, a tremendous drive for membership in this country. Branches have been established in New York, Chicago, San Francisco and thirty-three other American cities, which is more than exist in Great Britain and all her dominions. It was recently announced that the American membership has increased in five years from 2,500 to 14,500.

This alien organization, through the sentiments expressed by its public speakers, through the writings in its official organ and through the activities of its members, marks itself as a deadly menace to American nationalism and a powerful propaganda agency for British-American union.

The *Landmark*, their official organ, published in Britain and in the interests of Britain, contains in almost every issue some such insidious statement as the following, for the beguilement and guidance of the English-Speaking Unionists in the United States:

“The important thing in thinking or writing about the miscalled Revolution of 1776 is to use no terms which may interfere with legitimate developments of co-operation between the English-speaking Commonwealths of the future. As Mr. George Beer has put it, ‘It is easily conceivable, and not at all improbable, that the political evolution of the near future may take such a course that the American Revolution will lose the great significance that is now attached to it, and will appear merely as a temporary separation of two kindred peoples whose inherent similarity was obscured by superficial differences, resulting from dissimilar economic and social conditions’.”

The *Landmark* has recently announced that the English-Speaking Union is about to endow a second chair of American history in an English University, since the one at the University of London, occupied by Dr. Robert McElroy, formerly of Princeton, has proved so successful. The *Landmark* claims a large degree of credit

due to the English-Speaking Union for McElroy's present activities:

"His remarks have a special interest for members of the English-Speaking Union, for it was through our Society that Lord Rothermere founded, with a gift of 20,000 pounds, the professorship which Dr. McElroy holds."

What quality of American history has McElroy been teaching there of such special interest to the English-Speaking Union? The *Landmark* tells us:

"Dr. McElroy said some wise things as to the value of sound historical study in promoting the friendship of nations, particularly that of England and America. He showed how careful research had established the fact that the American Revolution was not a war between England and America but between the liberal and reactionary men of both lands. With regard to the War of 1812, historians provided convincing evidence that America had fought on the wrong side, in view of what the victory of Napoleon would have meant to America as well as to Europe."

Such is the quality of American history the English-Speaking Union approves and instigates and is going to have more of by endowing another chair just like McElroy's.

The American president of the English-Speaking Union is John W. Davis, a lawyer for J. P. Morgan and Company and the international banking interests. During his candidacy for the presidency of the United

States in 1924 Mr. Davis, for reasons unexplained, withdrew his name from the head of the roster of this Society and after his defeat restored it. The American chairman of the board of directors is George W. Wickersham, another Morgan lawyer and international banking agent. Foremost among its American promoters is George Haven Putnam, a prominent New York book publisher, born in London, who was a leading speaker at the meeting in which was organized the English-Speaking Union, in London, in July, 1918. Putnam's speech was soon after printed in pamphlet form, with the title, "*A Declaration of Interdependence*," and was among the first documents widely distributed in promotion of the Society.

In his speech and pamphlet Putnam said:

"I want to see not the Declaration of Independence, but a Declaration of Interdependence— an acknowledgment that the two peoples belong together."

In that speech and pamphlet Putnam gave his English compatriots this assurance:

"Text books are now being prepared which will present a juster account (in the United States) of the events of 1775-1783, 1812-1815 and 1861-1865."

English-Speaking Union officials did not stop at mere promises of revision of our school histories; they set actively at work revising them.

A Director of the English-Speaking Union, Matthew

Page Andrews, is the author of a school history which teaches American children that our Civil War was caused by perfidy and broken promises of President Lincoln; this infamous slander being lifted bodily from Greg's bitterly hostile British history and set into American school history.

The *Landmark* for July, 1926, page 430, conveys this interesting information:

"Once the decision to start the English-Speaking Union had been come to at a dinner of British and American friends in 1918, as previously recorded in the *Landmark*, the first member from the United States to be enrolled was a professor from a Western university."

It chances that this first American professor to join up, as previously recorded in the *Landmark*, was Prof. Andrew C. McLaughlin, head of the History Department of the University of Chicago. Prof. McLaughlin was also one of three zealots who founded the English-Speaking Union "sister society" in the United States, and is still a Director. In view of this, what sort of school history teaching might be expected of Prof. McLaughlin, regarding the American Revolution? His high school text, *History of the American Nation*, furnishes answer in a typical paragraph, page 152:

"Only oppression and serious danger can justify war. It cannot be said that the colonies had actually suffered much. It might be even seen that the mother

country was not at all tyrannical in taxing the colonies to pay for defending them, and beyond question George III and his pliant ministers had no interest in treating the colonies with cruelty."

Such are the teachings of leading American representatives of this British propaganda agency which seeks to seduce our people into British-American union. Such influences, co-operating with international banking interests and Carnegie endowments, pensions, annuities, perquisites, degrees and promotions, do induce many statesmen, college presidents and professors, authors, lecturers, preachers and editors, as well as school historians, superintendents and teachers, to disparage American annals, ideals, policies and achievements, and exalt those of Great Britain.

Professor Claude H. Van Tyne, head of the history department in the University of Michigan, in a recent speech to his Anglo-American compatriots of the English-Speaking Union of Detroit, said:

"We should say, I suppose, that the cowardly British charged up Bunker Hill the third time, but that would hardly be right. It would be more correct to say that British pluck came through in the crisis, but, as a matter of fact, that is not said either."

In this Professor Van Tyne has parroted what he had previously said in his "American History" lecture in the British House of Lords, May 13, 1927. In England the House of Lords, and in this country an

English-Speaking Union meeting serve fitly as forums where Van Tyne speaks freely. His subliminal soul finds best expression in sympathetic company.

A convincing, though somewhat ludicrous, test of Prof. Van Tyne's honesty in this statement is conveniently at hand. In his Anglicized *History of the United States for Schools*, Revised, 1919, Van Tyne ended his brief account of the Battle of Bunker Hill with these words:

"But British pluck triumphed."—p. 159.

When this and other treason texts were attacked and thrown out of the public schools of New York City and countless other communities, Van Tyne "corrected" his book and made this line read:

"But the British tried again."

This is but one among about eighty "corrections" which an aroused patriotic protest forced Van Tyne to make in his textbook or have it completely discarded. But now again this ball-bearing weather-cock, Van Tyne, shifting with the breeze, is boldly boasting in the security of an English-Speaking Union meeting that "British pluck came through." If this is "more correct," and ought to be said, why did he change his textbook? Of which does he convict himself—falsehood or cowardice—or both?

Marvelous "pluck" in 3,000 trained British troops

and cannon defeating 800 patriot militiamen, after their powder was gone!

Marvelous pluck and "scientific exactness" in the historian who talks big in the House of Lords and in English-Speaking Union meetings about what ought to be said but "is not said," and neglects to add that he had said it but had to erase it to save his text from universal exclusion from American public schools!

There is modern means of conquest more menacing than armies, battleships, submarines, bomb-planes or poison gas. It is the sinister propaganda contrived to delude and degrade the national mind, stupefy the patriotic spirit and disintegrate the body politic, that alien interests may work their will under cover of "accord."

Every ejection of an Anglicized history from a public school helps to discredit all pernicious foreign propaganda, generates popular resistance against it, strengthens national sense and patriotic spirit and counts powerfully for real solidarity based on the true and fundamental American traditions. In thousands of communities, great and small, throughout our land, it is being seen how the glowing fire of this issue illumines, how it warms regard for our menaced truths, how it heats righteous wrath to effective action, and transmutes all phases of race consciousness into a consistent and solidified American patriotism.

X.

THE RHODES SCHOLARSHIP FUND

*For "Ultimate Recovery of the United States
as an Integral Part of the British Empire"*

THE Rhodes scholarship fund, through which hundreds of selected American young men are sent to Oxford University and returned to us Anglicized, has as one of its purposes, as Cecil Rhodes wrote in the first draft of his will, "the ultimate recovery of the United States of America as an integral part of the British Empire."

Rhodes' declared purpose is to be found clearly set forth in "*Cecil Rhodes*," an authoritative biography by Basil Williams, pages 50-1-2:

"Only one race, so it seemed to him (Rhodes), approached God's type, his own Anglo-Saxon race; God's purpose, then, was to make the Anglo-Saxon race predominant, and the best way to help on God's work and fulfill his purpose in the world was to contribute to the predominance of the Anglo-Saxon race and so bring nearer the reign of justice, liberty and peace. . . .

"Many have vaguely held the same creed of the divinely-appointed mission of the British race; but few, like Rhodes, have made it a direct spur to action throughout their lives. . . .

"With that curious mixture of child and prophet so

often found in great men, this boyish document, (the first draft of Rhodes' will) directed that a Secret Society should be endowed with the following objects: 'The extension of British rule throughout the world . . . the colonization by British subjects of all lands where the means of livelihood are attainable by energy, labor and enterprise, and especially the occupation by British settlers of the entire continent of Africa, the Holy Land, the Valley of the Euphrates, the islands of Cyprus and Candia, the whole of South America, the islands of the Pacific not heretofore possessed by Great Britain, the whole of the Malay Archipelago, the seaboard of China and Japan, the ultimate recovery of the United States of America as an integral part of the British Empire." . . .

"In 1882, 1888, 1891 and 1893 he made further wills, all with the same intention." . . .

Fantastic dream? Fantastic as the design appears, it already has been largely fulfilled. The Holy Land, the valley of the Euphrates, all of the islands of the Pacific south of the Equator, Candia and Cyprus and most of the continent of Africa are now under British control. It is no fantastic dream. Startling progress has been made toward the Anglicization of American colleges, school text books, the lecture platform, the pulpit, the press and other channels of public education.

So mightily have Rhodes' designs already worked out to extend the domain and enhance the prestige of the British Empire that over the new entrance of Oriel Col-

lege, Oxford, Cecil Rhodes' statue has been set up above those of England's kings.

Cecil Rhodes was no mere dreamer of fantastic dreams. He had the knowledge of human greed, vanities and weaknesses, the calculating foresight, the patient skill and persistency of genius and the ruthless ambition to make his dreams come true. At the last he had the millions to work out his will. When such a man has regarded a project as feasible, has planned it through his lifetime, and invested his millions in it to carry it out after he is gone, it cannot be regarded as a mere dream, unworthy of serious consideration.

The Rhodes Scholarship Fund for American youth provides for two free scholarships from each State of the Union, or ninety-six at a time from all the States, at Oxford University, England. Each student is assigned the sum of 350 pounds a year for three years. Eligibles for these scholarships must have done at least two years' successful work in some college of standing, but they are to be chosen mainly on account of their force of character and capacity for leadership. Social qualities, literary and oratorical tendencies and records in athletics count rather than scholarship in their selection.

The purpose of the Rhodes Scholarship Fund is to imbue talented young Americans, fitted for leadership, with imperialistic ambition for British-American union.

This is not bare statement alone. Rhodes scholars have persistently and openly advocated British-American union. One of them is Prof. George Louis Beer, whose book, "*The English-Speaking Peoples*," is a frank and open plea not only for understanding but for unity of the English-speaking peoples. Prof. Bernadotte E. Schmitt, another Rhodes graduate, innocently says in the preface of his book, "*England and Germany*":

"A beneficiary of the Rhodes trust, I was imbued with the idea of Anglo-Saxon solidarity."

Few can have forgotten the question about the Rhodes scholars that was widely discussed in the American press during the summer of 1927. The question had been raised by Herbert Albert Laurens Fisher, warden of New College, Oxford, lately British Government Education Minister and for many years a trustee of the Rhodes fund. The question was:

"Are Rhodes scholars now running the country (the United States) as Cecil Rhodes hoped they would?"

At the 1923 meeting of the Rhodes Trustees at Oxford it was stated that

"Twenty-two leading American newspapers are in accord with the Rhodes plan."

It is well known that the Cecil Rhodes Secret Society has international scope and influence, and it is popularly

said in England that twelve of its members are high officials of the American Government, while two of them are in control of our most heavily-financed educational foundations. George H. Putnam, New York book publisher, who helped to organize the English-Speaking Union, has boasted in a speech in London that

“the United States Government is now securely in Anglo-Saxon hands.”

There are now living 500 Rhodes scholars who have completed the Oxford course and returned to America. They have a Rhodes Scholars' Alumni Association, a source of continuous propaganda in advocacy and defense of the Anglicized school histories. The ceaseless song of the returned Rhodes Scholars is that American school history always in the past has been too militant in its appeal and has perpetuated the ancient grudge against Britain.

Outstanding fact refutes this. Our history has not made us a warring people. On the contrary, it has made us the world's outstanding people of peace. It has not perpetuated grudges. On the contrary, it has been the world's best influence for international good will, all around the earth.

It is not that the unsullied story of the struggle of our fathers ought to be maintained for any militant appeal, or to perpetuate any ancient grudge. But it must be

preserved for the sake of its continued inspiration, strength and guidance for ourselves and for our children, and for the sake of its unmatched force for righteousness, understanding and peace among the nations.

A nation can have but one history—a history which recounts, not only the mistakes and weaknesses of that nation, but also its glorious achievements, the virtues of its heroes and the strength and purity of its life. Hart, Van Tyne and similar revisionists of our history have, through their alterations, fastened on the vitals of America a malignant, foul growth that must slowly, surely eat its way into the soul-seat of the nation, if tolerated.

The American concept of freedom—of the rights of man—which has advanced our nation to first place in character, achievement and prestige, and for a century and a half has been steadily enlightening and liberating the world, is being insidiously destroyed, that the world may be given English-Speaking—or Anglo-Saxon—union and domination—whatever that may prove to mean.

XI.

“INTERDEPENDENCE DAY”

Pro-British Agencies at Work to Have Magna Charta Eclipse the Declaration of Independence

PATRIOTIC Americans have learned with amazement and indignation how Anglicized school history is teaching our children that the Declaration of Independence seems now to be largely “unreasonable,” and Fourth of July jubilation “foolish.” These teachings are directly traceable to definite foreign influences.

One of a dozen or more British propaganda agencies created in London and operating in our country is the Magna Charta Day Association, which advocates our national observance of June 15, as “Interdependence Day,” the natal day of free government, instead of, or at least in eclipse of, the Fourth of July.

“Not Another Legal Holiday” is the significant slogan which the organized boosters of Magna Charta Day observance carry at the top of their letterheads and circulars. It is significant because general adoption of their declared theory regarding the origin of our rights and liberties would automatically eliminate the Declaration of Independence as an epoch-making document

and render any celebration of July 4 indeed "foolish."

An outlined purpose of the association is:

"by means of Magna Charta Study Clubs to encourage the widespread study of the origin and development of our liberties, and to promote an annual day of commemoration by the Seven Nations."

Official pronouncement declares:

"There are immense possibilities for good in the annual observance of Magna Charta Day—Liberty Day.

"Magna Charta is the great outstanding event in the history of World Liberty.

"The Magna Charta Day Association seeks to develop a greater sense of unity of thought and purpose of the SEVEN NATIONS.

"It is important to have in mind THE ESSENTIAL AND ACTUAL SOLIDARITY OF THE SEVEN NATIONS—The United States and the six other nations of the British Union—Great Britain and Ireland, Newfoundland, Canada, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand."¹

If all this means anything at all, what can it mean but British-American union, in mind, soul and body? The "Seven Nations" is only a new, a sweeter and more seductive sound.

Any lingering doubt as to the meaning is utterly dispelled by the fact that the British Committee at the head of this association consists of Lady Astor, the Rt. Rev.

¹ The capitalization is their own.

J. E. C. Weldon and the Rt. Hon. Sir Gilbert Parker, Bart. Parker alone is enough to characterize the organization. He is the most able and persistent of all the advocates of a British-American "international mind" in all theories and projects that are strictly for British succor or British advantage. The American Secretary is J. W. Hamilton, an Englishman, long the Editor of the *English-Speaking World*, the official organ of a dozen pro-British and pacifist agencies operating in this country.

This Magna Charta Day Association is connected up with the alteration of our school histories directly and definitely.

One familiar link is Matthew Page Andrews, whose name stands at the head of the list of American Committeemen of the Magna Charta Day Association. He is the same Andrews who is a Director of the English-Speaking Union and author of three American school histories into one of which he stealthily has transplanted from a hostile British history the assertion that our Civil War was due to perfidy and broken promises of Lincoln.

Results of the activities and influences of these propaganda organizations may be traced in this direction distinctly. The touchstone for unfailing test is the Anglicized school history, which is propaganda product that is so definite and so securely trapped as to be incapable of escape from thorough analysis.

The McLaughlin and Van Tyne *History of the United States for Schools*, 1919, distorts the glorious meaning of our great national holiday and discredits the Declaration it commemorates, thus:

“The reason we celebrate the Fourth instead of the second of July is that most men thought more about the day Congress voted to accept a declaration drawn up by Thomas Jefferson explaining to the world the reasons for making the resolution of independence. A list of twenty-seven grievances was given, some of which seem unreasonable now, but others constituted real wrongs.”—pp. 163-4.

The joyous enthusiasm of the people following July 4th, 1776, is rebuked:

“Among the Whigs, or Patriots, the news was joyfully received. Some thoughtless people went too far and did foolish things, like burning an effigy of the king or burning his portrait in a public square. In New York City the American soldiers pulled down a leaden statue of King George III and melted it into bullets.”—p. 164.

The American school youth of yesterday thought this was just about the best use to which a king's statue ever was put; but what can the school youth of tomorrow be thinking, after feeding on such tainted meat?

Such disparagement in revised school history is not mere unintentional error. It is to be shown, in facts which cannot be controverted and which will carry conviction, that these and other gross alterations recently

made in many of our school histories are a direct result of definite design and organized propaganda.

The McLaughlin and Van Tyne school history, first published in 1911, contained then no mention whatever of Magna Charta. This grant of rights to English barons, made in the year 1215, and now suddenly put forward as "the great outstanding event in the history of World Liberty," was not recognized at all by this pair of historians so early as 1911.

But since then McLaughlin and Van Tyne have become wondrously enlightened or illusioned. In their revised and Anglicized edition of 1919 appears a full new chapter, of fifteen pages, in which Magna Charta, unworthy even of mention eight years before, now looms very large and important.

In this newly-inserted Magna Charta chapter the Declaration of Independence is represented to be largely a plagiarism from writings of the Englishman, John Locke. This is put to our school children thus:

"Locke had expressed essentially the same ideas. This sounds very much like what we read in the American Declaration of Independence."—p. 199.

In this new vision and new version of 1919 this pair of revisionists discerned and inserted in their new chapter the theory that the American Constitution is a mere written copy of the unwritten British constitution, de-

veloped from Magna Charta, stating it to the school children in these words:

“How the English ideas of Government affected our Government can best be seen by reading our own Constitution, in that most of it is included in a single document, while the English Constitution is made up of many laws, court decisions and customs.”—p. 197.

A half-dozen other school history revisionists, in Anglicizing their texts, have turned to teaching this de-Americanizing theory. Muzzey, Greenlaw, Ward, O'Hara and Everett Barnes teach it, and West teaches that the American Bill of Rights, the Declaration and the Constitution

“all go back to ancient English charters, even for their wording.”

When parents of today were school children the history texts were still based on authenticated facts and patriotic spirit, not on imported propaganda theories, nor on “emotions of new-found gratitude to England.”

A good school history then in common use (William Swinton's, 1871 and 1893) outlines as follows the origin of some of the more vital and truly characteristic principles and institutions of America:

“It is not from England, but from Holland, that we have derived the written ballot, the self-government of towns and their representation in a general legislature.

"It was in Holland that the English Puritans, themselves refugees from oppression, learned whatever of religious toleration they afterwards practiced in New England.

"Long before the Bible was printed in England the people of Holland had read many editions of it.

"In Holland the clergy was not of the estates of the realm, and this example has been followed in our own separation of Church and State."

Such were the facts everywhere accepted and undisputed up to a little while ago. But what a change now comes over the spirit and substance of school history!

All of the Anglicized revisionists, with one accord, have reversed these facts. Greenlaw's version is this:

"Our institutions have grown from English institutions and are of the same organic texture.

"The Declaration of Independence is in complete accord with the English tradition of liberty."—
p. 207.

The many sources of American principles and institutions form a subject quite properly open to most complex controversy. This is all the more reason why school historians should not seek to dispose of it in dogmatic assertions based on "emotions of new-found gratitude to England," and contrary to previously accepted facts.

Such is not American history; it is British propaganda invention. All real history rebukes and disproves it. These zealous seekers after obscure sources of our

liberties, who contemptuously disparage the American Declaration and Constitution, must necessarily overlook the verdict of world statesmanship summed up by their own Gladstone, who said:

"The American Constitution is the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

With all due respect for Magna Charta, patriotic Americans must agree with Gladstone, and indignantly protest against the teaching to our children of the theory that human liberty consists in a set of specified rights for English barons, granted by a scared King.

True American spirit must insist, instead, that our children shall continue to be taught, as in the past, the real, distinctive American doctrines by which our liberties and ideals of self-government must continue to be interpreted if they are to endure unimpaired.

Magna Charta recognized government as somehow existent and fixed, superior to its subjects. The marked feature of this document is a forced grant from King John of certain specified rights to his barons. It is, if not the first, at least the greatest charter ever granted to Special Privilege. It is over-rated as a source of democracy.

The Declaration of Independence was revolutionary. It proclaimed the people sovereign, and government

their instrument. It recognized all men as equally endowed with rights directly by the Creator. This Government was set up, not to grant rights, but to render them secure. The old relation of government and privilege was turned completely upside down. Government of the people, by the people and for the people, here established as an experiment, has been vindicated, has been maintained, and has widely extended.

This is distinctive Americanism. It has stood every test of time. It has leavened the world with liberty. This is the conception which has inspired our ideals, perfected our solidarity and morale as a free people and advanced us to first place in power and prestige among the nations. This is the vital truth by which tyrannies are destroyed, kings dethroned and imperialism checked, while free government steadily extends its sway throughout the world.

Constitutions may be amended and reinterpreted. Statutes may be repealed and policies repudiated. The annals, ideals and moral sense of a people may be altered. Tremendous efforts are organized and at work to these ends. But the Declaration of Independence is a completed and sealed document. It is eternally monumented in words of one meaning. It is securely imbedded as the base of every true republic that has been built since 1776. Democracy without it would be as empty as religion without God.

By no means least important among the Magna Charta committeemen is George E. Roberts, vice-president and publicity manager of the National City Bank, New York, and a director and the propaganda expert of the International Banking Corporation.

Roberts also, in association with Henry S. Pritchett, president of the Carnegie Foundation, conducts a correspondence school in "Economics for Business Executives," another spacious channel of propaganda for special privilege. So there is not lacking a direct link between the Magna Charta theory and the international banking clique of special-privileged barons who thrive through imperialistic world exploitation.

Nor is there lacking direct contact with the \$300,000,000 Carnegie Foundation, to which, it seems, any British propagandists may submit any plan to denationalize America, and secure ample endowment. They may also be supplied with certified officials and associates out of a long list of Anglo-American college presidents and professors, other educators and preachers, decorated and degreed, pensioned or near-pensioned, all guaranteed to be thoroughly de-Americanized and securely subsidized into keen sympathy with the Carnegie design of "the Re-United States, the British-American Union."

XII.

NOT ACCORD BUT DISCORD

British School Histories Refute Treason Texts—All but One Teach True Causes of Our Independence

NOW THAT we have acquired a fairly full understanding of the motives and methods of the hands-across-the-sea agencies in revising and denaturing American school history to cultivate mutual understanding and accord between the American and the British peoples, it may be very interesting to know to what extent, if any, British school histories are being revised to the same end.

Utterly astonishing are the facts found.

Only one out of more than forty histories used in the schools of England has been written to accord with the teachings of our own treason texts. Even more astonishing is the fact that this one is the only British school history to be found which is grossly unjust and virulent in its attitude toward America.

School History of England, by C. R. L. Fletcher and Rudyard Kipling fully accords with our treason texts in anti-American spirit, in defamation of our great leaders, in distortion of our national ideals and in

falsifications generally; and it is the only British school history that does so. Rudyard Kipling, the outstanding poet-publicist of British imperialism, has common cause with the Van Tynes, the Harts and the Muzzeys.

Strikingly illustrative of the character of the Kipling *School History of England*, in complete accord in spirit and purpose with our treason texts, is the following typical passage:

“Soon after the peace of 1763 we began to perceive one result of the conquest of Canada which few people had expected. Our American colonies, having no French to fear any longer, wanted to be free from our control altogether. They utterly refused to pay a penny of the two hundred million pounds that the war had cost us, and they equally refused to maintain a garrison of British soldiers. They intended to shake off all our restrictions on their trade, and to buy and sell in whatever market they could find. When Our Parliament proposed in 1764 to make them pay a small fraction of the cost of the late war, they called it ‘oppression’ and prepared to rebel. ‘We are Whigs,’ they said. ‘Whigs always resist oppression. You English Whigs did so in 1688.’”

As if this might not clearly enough define to English youth the attitude and spirit of the colonists, the following poetical interpretation is included in this “accord” history:

'Twas not while England's sword unsheathed
Put half a world to flight,
Nor while their new-built cities breathed
Secure behind her might;
Not while she poured from Pole to Line
Treasure and ships and men—
These worshippers at Freedom's shrine
They did not quit her then!

Not till their foes were driven forth
By England o'er the main—
Not till the Frenchman from the north
Had gone, with shattered Spain;
Not till the clean-swept ocean showed
No hostile flag unrolled,
Did they remember what they owed
To freedom—and were bold.

This Kipling text, while it accords with our Anglicized histories, does not at all accord with the British texts in general.

In view of the organized and endowed movement in this country to denature the Declaration of Independence, ostensibly for the sake of Anglo-American accord, most Americans must be amazed to learn that this virile document is taught in full in many of the common schools of England.

A History of England for Schools, by Keatinge and Frazer, a text generally in use throughout England, devotes twenty-three pages to the causes and course of the American Revolution, and contains in full the Declaration of Independence, Franklin's letter to Priestley, justifying it, Washington's Long Island address to his troops, copious portions of Burke's and Pitt's speeches in behalf of the colonists, and the speech of George III, announcing to Parliament American Independence. "Make an abstract of the essential points of the Declaration of Independence" is one of the test exercises in this British text.

Selections from Sources of English History, by C. W. Colby, another popular British school text, includes in full Fox's eulogy of Washington and Burke's Speech on Conciliation of the Colonies.

This is not any recent innovation. There has been no "Americanization" of British school histories. These texts have long been as they are now.

The defamation of our nation's founders and distortions of our annals, ideals and policies, which characterize our own altered school histories, are not found in the British texts. The "international mind" that is being promoted through Rhodes and Carnegie endowments and countless propaganda agencies is not the common mind of the American and British peoples, but the mind of financial imperialism, which knows no

country but as subject of exploitation, regards governments according to their efficiency as collection agencies, and wants America and Great Britain to unite in support of its own usurious loans and extortions. Robust Americanism stands in the way; it stands for world liberation, not world exploitation. The purpose is to pervert it in our own public schools.

The British history texts in general use in the common schools of England are immeasurably more favorable toward America in treatment of the Revolution than are our own Anglicized histories.

Popular texts besides those mentioned are the *Westminster School History*, Gardiner's, Wyatt-Davies', Higham's, and Lucy Dale's. None of these teach that Great Britain was in the right in our Revolution, or leave any doubt but that she was in the wrong.

The Westminster text tersely says:

"A blundering ministry brought on the greatest disaster that ever befell the British Empire."

The Keatinge and Frazer text says:

"In 1765 the first step was taken in the unwise statesmanship which resulted in the independence of the American colonies."

Lucy Dale's *Landmarks of British History*, a great favorite in elementary grades, teaches thus:

"Great Britain soon gave them an excellent reason for separation. As early as 1765 our Ministers and Parliament had made the mistake of putting on a tax for people in America to pay, so that their money would be taken without their opinion being asked. . . . Nowadays it is difficult to believe that we were ever so stupidly selfish in our treatment of them."

If, as Napoleon said, "history is the facts agreed on," the annals of the Revolution are established in the common mind of England and America alike. The teachings throughout the British texts regarding the separation are essentially the same as those of our own standard school histories, unquestioned until Anglo-mania suddenly set in here among some of our historians, who proclaim discoveries due to their superior scholarship and new scientific methods.

The British writers of school history make no pretense of "higher historical scholarship," new methods or any altruistic purpose. For example: "My object in writing this *Elementary History of England*," Wyatt-Davies says in his preface,

"has been to provide a text-book suitable for junior scholars in secondary schools. In doing so I have followed the well-beaten path already traversed by the large company of writers of school books on English history."

Quite on the contrary, our Anglicized revisionists declare their departure from the well-beaten path and

their contempt for the "old yarns" of accepted history. They boast for their viewpoints the merit of being new.

Muzzey begins the preface of his *An American History*:

"The present volume represents the newer tendencies in historical writing. Its aim is not to tell over once more the old story in the old way," etc.

West says the prime object of his *History of the American People* is

"to emphasize the historical grounds for friendship between England and America in spite of old sins and misunderstandings."

Guitteau's *Our United States*, the Anglicized edition of which is now junked, was

"written in the light of recent events in which a new atmosphere has been created."

Ward says that in his interpretation of Burke's Speech he was guided by

"emotions of new-found gratitude to England."

To sustain this new atmosphere and these new emotions, tendencies and theories, our Anglo-American revisionists have ruthlessly omitted or distorted vital facts long established in British as well as American school histories. Not only have they fallen into con-

flict with "the facts agreed on," but they now are involved in irreconcilable contradictions among themselves.

"The English colonial system had guided and guarded the colonies while they needed help and protection; it was not tyrannical;" and "they had prospered and grown strong under English institutions," notwithstanding "it is hard for us to realize how ignorant and superstitious were most of the early colonists of America." Such is the spirit of the Anglicized histories that were to be imposed on the school children of America, by revisionists professing to be Americans.

British school history is in striking contrast. *Landmarks of British History* is teaching English school children:

"Perhaps the chief cause of the steady growth and the prosperity of our American colonists was the character of the men and women who founded them. Besides realizing this we have to remember what drove these first American colonists out of England. They would not let a government tyrannize over them in one way or an Established Church in another way."

Nowhere in the British texts can be found any intimation that the colonists acted through ignorance or superstition, or that their thriving was through help from England; instead, it is taught that they thrived

in spite of English interference, extortions and oppressions. The Wyatt-Davies text puts one phase of it:

"Great Britain learnt wisdom from her defeat. Hitherto the colonies had been looked upon too much as a source of profit for the mother country; if her interests clashed with theirs it had always been the colonies which must give way. Now a wiser line of policy was adopted."—*Elementary History of England*, p. 261.

Muzzey's *An American History*, even after having gone through five "corrected" editions, is still teaching American youth that it was

"a debatable question, namely, whether the abuses of the King's ministers justified armed resistance."
—p. 115.

In the common schools of England this is not a debatable question. Every British text-book teaches that armed resistance of the colonies was justified and inevitable. In no public school in America should it be permitted to appear a debatable question.

Ward in his Anglicized text book for American schools teaches:

"The American Revolution was not an attempt of England to tyrannize over the colonies, but was a quarrel fomented by a German king as part of his programme of despotic ambition. It was a contest between German tyranny and English freedom."

The British texts, while they uniformly condemn the unwise British policies that alienated America, neither make George III a "German" scape-goat nor teach that the English people were opposed to his policies or in sympathy with the revolting colonists. What they all say is typified in the following:

"The fact was that the king and the majority of the English nation were in favor of the war."—History of England for Schools, p. 458.

"George III, and the great majority of the nation, were determined to carry on the struggle."—Elementary History of England, p. 199.

Excuses are offered in our Anglicized histories for the British vandalism in burning Washington; but not so in the British texts. Wyatt-Davies, for instance, says it was

"an act of warfare which rightly caused bitter indignation,"

and several quote from Green's *History of the English People* that

"Few more shameful acts are recorded in our history."

Chambers' *Twentieth-Century Geography Readers*, Book VIA, p. 265, frankly teaches English school children the following vital fact regarding the virility of Americanism:

"This vast country shows a wonderful power of absorbing men of different nationalities, and turning them into loyal citizens of the United States. Whatever the land of their birth, they soon become proud of the country of their adoption."

Most authors of British text-books are infinitely more generous in their estimates of American heroes who fought against Great Britain than is any one of our Anglicized authors.

Of Washington:

"His patience, wisdom, coolness and unselfish Patriotism had procured the success of a long and bitter struggle."—King Alfred Readers, Book VII, p. 199.

"He was of the true order of great men. He had wisdom and courage and loved his country; he was eager to do and dare, but never rash; he was true and honest in all he undertook; and, above all, he was lofty of soul and serene in temper under the harshest trial. No matter how black the future seemed, or how severely he was tried by the treachery or ingratitude of those for whom he labored, he went calmly, steadily on, doing his duty and never fearing but that the right would prevail."—Peeps at History, America, p. 29.

Gaskoin quotes an American (possibly an Anglo-American professor of history) as saying apologetically to an English princess: "I can hardly believe . . . that I was brought up to abhor the memory of George III." "That is very unfair," the princess replied,

“for I was brought up to adore the memory of George Washington.”¹

Finnemore in *Peeps at History, America*, teaches English school children regarding the American Revolution:

“How was this striking change brought about? By the stupidity of George III, then King of England, and of his Ministers, who tried to fetter the limbs of a free people, and found that all ties, whether friendly or unfriendly, were broken in the struggle.”—p. 27.

In contrast with this fair British statement is a parallel assertion in one of our “new method” American texts, by Professor Ward:

“What had brought about this disastrous change? The German king of England, George III. . . . So the American Revolution was a contest between German tyranny and English freedom.”

Black’s *America in Pictures*, popular in the schools of England, compresses more truth in a sentence than any of our “new method” authors gets into all his book:

“Britain did not govern her colonies wisely; she interfered in their affairs and imposed unjust taxes. At last the thirteen states on the Atlantic seaboard revolted.”—p. 50.

With these direct and clearly intelligible statements of truth in the British school histories let us compare

¹ *Britain in the Modern World*, p. 135.

the apologetic and stupidly confusing statement in *History of the United States for Schools*, by McLaughlin and Van Tyne:

“There is little use trying to learn whose fault it was that the war began, for, as we have seen, such a long train of events led to disagreement between England and America that we should have to go back and back to the very founding of the colonies. As in most quarrels, the blame for the beginning is laid by each party on the other.”
—p. 152.

Another British school history explains Parliament's taxation and the sufferings of the American colonists

“from the ill-effects of Britain's bad old ‘colonial policy’—a policy based upon the mistaken principle that all colonial trade ought to pass through the mother country.”—Chambers' *Periodic Histories*, Book VII, p. 248.

Our treason texts “accord” with this only in calling England the “mother country.” If statement of the causes of the Revolution, lifted at random from almost any British school history, should be set into any one of our “new method” texts, it would create as great confusion and contradiction as our Anglicized authors have created among themselves.

Another British school text teaches:

“*The quarrel was, perhaps, inevitable, but it certainly was hastened by the obstinacy and unwisdom of the king.*”—Nelson's *School History*, p. 324.

The widely-used *King Alfred Readers* emphasize as the chief cause of separation the unyielding objection of the colonists to taxation without representation:

"The chief cause of the quarrel may be expressed in a few words. The British Parliament wished to tax the colonists to help to defray the expenses of the war with the French. In this case it may have been quite right that the colonists should help to pay for the work which has been done for them at tremendous cost. But a principle was at stake. This was expressed succinctly in the cry raised in all the colonies, 'No taxation without representation.' The colonists were not represented in the British Parliament, which claimed the right to impose the tax. They would tax themselves through their own governing bodies or they would not be taxed at all."—Book VIII, p. 195.

It is becoming clear that the fabrications offered by our Anglicizationists, in the sweet name of Anglo-American concord of understanding, can be conducive only to discord.

Their perversions and distortions fit into neither British nor American annals, for the established and long-accepted "facts agreed on" in the school histories of both America and England disprove and repel them.

Sycophantically seeking to gain scholastic and social standing in England, dazzled by huge imperialistic educational foundations and prompted by designing international propagandists, some of our historians and

college professors have attempted to denature our school histories and denationalize our children; but only to encounter on the one hand an aroused American patriotism consigning their books to junk-heaps, and on the other hand a solid phalanx of British school history texts standing in refutation of the very falsehoods invented to curry English favor.

The teachings in the common schools are a mighty force; they form the fundamental substance of a people's settled public opinion and fixed national policies. The substantially uniform teachings in the standard American and British school histories, regarding "the ancient grudge" have, through successive generations, contributed steadily toward wholesome nationalism and patriotic loyalty on each side and toward the genuine understanding and sincere friendship securely existing between the two peoples.

The English people always have despised Benedict Arnold. In one of our Anglicized texts this traitor is given a half-page of praise; but the blot of his name does not appear in any British school history. The English common people are not likely to hold any different regard for renegade Americans of today. The time is long past when the English people even, let alone ourselves, might be brought to believe through means of treason texts that the American Revolution was without justification in its causes and results.

The false versions injected into our Anglicized school histories, debasing America and exalting Britain, are not the versions current among the common people of England, but are versions devised by imperialistic financiers, publicists, politicians, collegiates and historians, united in an organized and endowed propaganda to win America into English-speaking domination of the world, under the British constitution and customs.

If the connection seems hazy, a ray of truth will clarify it and illumine the situation, which really is simple.

The British constitution, laws, traditions and custom all facilitate and sustain financial imperialism and render secure the exploitation of weak peoples.

It has been so for generations, as everybody knows, under the sanction of British law and protection of the British flag.

Following the World War, as never before in all history, the woes and helplessness of many of the peoples of the world laid them subject to imperialistic financial exploitation.

Never were the international financial forces so well organized to exploit. But British imperialism alone is no longer able to sustain them in their far-extended graspings.

Following the gravitation of their gold to the one safe refuge, America, they must now operate, if at all, from Wall Street, as they formerly did from London, and under American law and the American flag. Theirs is a piracy which demands governmental protection.

Here is a serious obstacle. The spirit and letter of the American Declaration of Independence, the United States Constitution, statutes, court decisions, trade treaties and fixed policies of the American Government, and all the annals, traditions, precepts and ideals of the American people are fundamentally and unalterably opposed to any imperialistic exploitation whatsoever.

So Special Privilege, lusting for world domination, will not have the Declaration of Independence celebrated. It will have it damned—will have it and its whole brood of statutes, policies, annals and ideals destroyed and buried in quick-lime of oblivion, deep beneath a mighty monument to Magna Charta. The machinery to that purpose is in full motion.

The imperialistic exploitation, which our fathers resisted, defied and cast off, is now being excused and exalted in school teachings to our children, and our fathers are defamed and their ideals distorted, because powerful organized interests in this country as well as in Britain seek world-wide exploitation today. “Eng-

lish-speaking domination," they call it, to make it sound sweet. But America has stood for Liberty, in whatsoever language spoken.

Traditional Americanism is the most virile and beneficent political force in the modern world. It stands for freedom, equality, cooperation and peace among all peoples, and not for domination and exploitation.

True American patriotism must indignantly resent and inflexibly resist and reject the sinister propaganda put upon us falsely in the specious name of Anglo-American accord.

As we have seen, there is and long has been substantial accord in the standard teachings in the schools of this country and of England concerning the ideals upon which our nation stands. The new teachings of the treason texts and of the Kipling text in England cannot promote accord, but can only produce discord.

Better relations between the United States and Great Britain, to be sound and secure, must be built upon truth and mutual understanding and respect, and not contrived through lying, poisonous and repulsive pro-British propaganda in America. The greatest step the imperialists could take toward better relations would be in smashing their obnoxious propaganda machine. Until this is done, relations will be anything but better.

XIII.

ON WAY TO THE JUNK-HEAP

The Treason Texts Riddled in Storm of Patriotic Protest—Their Withdrawals and Corrections

THE wide-spread Hearst Newspapers began publishing in the summer of 1921 and steadily continued for four years a series of exposures of the treason texts. These articles made clear to the nation the alterations that had been effected in the school histories, and the influences, foreign and native, that had caused them.

The issue was forced upon the attention of New York City's public school authorities and its municipal government. The result was two searching and long-extended investigations into the whole subject during the winter of 1921-2, and two reports, one from the school system and the other from the municipality, both of which fully sustained the complaints, condemned the Anglicized histories and banned them from the schools until specified corrections should be made.

Twenty-one superintendents, principals and teachers, experienced school men and women of the best training and attainments, selected and appointed for their special qualifications to investigate the complaints, and having no mission but to sift out the truth, afforded complain-

ants, authors, publishers and all others interested full opportunity to be heard, and as result issued a detailed critical statement concerning more than five hundred objectionable alterations found, from the viewpoint of the practical school man. This report condemned as unfit for public school use, and banned until corrected every one of the texts used in the New York City public schools against which complaints had been formally filed—those of Everett Barnes, Guiteau, Hart, McLaughlin and Van Tyne, Ward and West. Later, the complaints against Muzzey's text were formally brought to the attention of the school authorities, and Prof. Muzzey was given the choice of correcting his book or having it banned.

This Committee's report definitely characterizes one of these authors as follows:

"Mr. West presents only the views of the counsel for the Crown. He is constantly finding defense for the course of action taken by the British Government. The American side of the argument is entirely ignored. No Weddeburn, no Crown advocate, could plead the British cause in a more bitterly partisan spirit than West has done."—pp. 51-2.

To the Committee's report the New York City Board of Superintendents added this observation:

"The paragraphs complained of in the books indicate an attitude of mind toward the founders of the Republic which, in our judgment, is entirely reprehensible."—p. 72.

Leaders of some of the greater national patriotic organizations became interested and one after another entered into a "Committee of Correspondence," which developed into THE PATRIOT LEAGUE FOR THE PRESERVATION OF AMERICAN HISTORY, with the proclaimed purpose:

"To purge the public schools of the treason texts and re-establish in their stead histories that teach the true American annals and inculcate true American spirit."

Soon the national and state heads of practically all of the American patriotic organizations and many fraternal organizations as well were working actively and in accord through THE PATRIOT LEAGUE, and the contest was carried into every state and into tens of thousands of communities. In some entire states the contest has been completely won through State School Board action, legislation, or otherwise. From many thousands of school districts all over the nation the treason texts have been thrown out as unfit for school use.

Never before were all the patriotic organizations of the United States so completely united on any issue as they now are in protest against Anglicized school history.

With unanimity and zeal the national bodies have denounced the insidious effort to denationalize America, and have aroused their entire memberships to activity in expelling the treason texts from the public schools.

The Sons of the American Revolution in their national congress have made this declaration:

"The Sons of the American Revolution, in National Congress assembled, express their deep interest in the subject of text-books on American history in use in our public schools. We protest against the use of any text-book which lauds the Tories and censures the Patriots, which maligns the memory of any of the great men of the Revolutionary period or undervalues the services and sacrifices by which our national independence was won."

In their next annual congress this great patriotic organization carried its position a step further:

"We demand that the story of our past be taught in such a way as to assure that the next generation be Americans and not merely Anglo-Saxons; that they become patriotic citizens with a veneration for the fathers and an appreciation of our political heritage; that their loyalty be to country and not to class, bloc or section."

The Descendants of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence in national meeting in Independence Hall, declared:

"We view with apprehension the tampering with the histories of the United States used in the public schools, in the interest of any foreign country, people, race or policies, in the belittling of the significance of the Declaration of Independence itself, by disparaging and ridiculing its signers and leaders in the Revolution, impugning their motives and holding them up to contempt of the youth of today, and

by ignoring some of the most celebrated of our heroes who gave all, even life itself, for the country's great cause."

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in national encampment, unanimously and with great enthusiasm adopted this resolution:

"Recognizing that grave charges have been made and proven to be true, that American history text books in use in public schools have lately been revised in un-American spirit, we demand that the treason texts be thrown out of the public schools of every State and that truthful histories be restored instead, and we pledge our unflagging efforts to this end."

The Grand Army of the Republic has uttered this exalted sentiment:

"The sympathetic teaching of true American history in the schools of our country is essential to the continued purity of our national patriotic spirit and ideals. We demand that our annals be preserved unimpaired, as the rightful heritage of posterity and as a guaranty that the future of our nation shall be as glorious as its past."

The Daughters of the American Revolution in their National Congress, two thousand delegates voting unanimously and with prolonged cheering, made this declaration:

"We condemn as unfit for school use those history texts which defame or ignore our heroic forefathers,

misrepresent the consecrated causes for which they struggled and sacrificed and misinterpret the fundamental principles upon which they established our liberties and our Nation. We pledge our ready co-operation with other patriotic bodies in practical measures for cleansing the public schools of these false and unpatriotic teachings."

The United Spanish War Veterans have declared in national encampment, and reiterated in many State encampments, in substance this resolution:

"We demand that our nation's true history be preserved to rising generations with view to wholesome cultivation of patriotic spirit, solidarity and morale, based upon right conceptions of the ideals and doctrines of American democracy."

The Illinois Federation of Women's Clubs:

"Resolved that this body of women recommend that a thorough investigation be made of all histories, readers and other text books used in the public schools of each locality, and that proper means be used through the strength of the various clubs to have the offending books forever disbarred from the schools."

Is it to be wondered at that all our great national patriotic societies, awakened and warned, have joined in The PATRIOT LEAGUE FOR THE PRESERVATION OF AMERICAN HISTORY and raised a storm of protest, nation-wide, which already has torn the altered texts out of tens of thousands of public schools, has set up

statutes against them in five states, and has been forcing their correction or sweeping them to the junk-heap?

The statutes in this matter provide generally:

"No history or other text-book shall be adopted for use or be used in any district school, city school, vocational school, or high school, which falsifies the facts regarding the War of Independence, or the War of 1812, or which defames our nation's founders or misrepresents the ideals and causes for which they struggled and sacrificed, or which contains propaganda favorable to any foreign government."

Any school found using any text book in violation of the measure would be deprived of State aid.

The literature on the subject has become quite voluminous. A booklet, *Treason to American Tradition*, issued by THE PATRIOT LEAGUE and republished by many patriotic organizations, has had wide distribution in every state, sounding alarm against the treason texts. Numerous city boards of education and several state boards have issued printed reports of their investigations of the falsified histories.

The people of Portland, Ore., led by the President General of the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution, found it necessary to get rid of their superintendent in order to free the schools of the Muzzey text, so secure upon his neck was the Ginn grip.

The patriotic organizations of New Jersey united in securing the ousting of David B. Corson, superintendent

of the public schools of Newark, and author of an Anglicized history, because he contemptuously treated their demand for a public hearing of their protest against the Muzzey history.

The Pennsylvania State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Thomas Finnegan, was dismissed by Governor Pinchot chiefly because Finnegan dallied and delayed in complying with the demands of a joint resolution of the State Assembly for appointment of a commission to investigate the treason texts.

Now another strange thing has happened.

The "Anglo-American professors of history," having perched themselves high upon self-erected pedestals of superior historical scholarship and posed as consecrated devotees to "scientifically-attested truth," while proclaiming their inspired revelations of our nation's shameful past and their vision of a bright future in Anglo-American coalition, have, one by one, proved to be but ball-bearing weathercocks that promptly swing with the shifting wind.

Six of them in the storm of patriotic protest have reversed their attitude and corrected their texts the best they could in conformity with the complaints against them.

How complete is this stultification and reversal is strikingly illustrated in these two prefaces of Guitteau's *Our United States*, 1919 and 1924:

ANGLICIZED EDITION, 1919: The momentous events of the last five years have demonstrated conclusively that our history text books must be written from a new viewpoint. The history of our national life should not be told as a narrative separate and distinct from that of the rest of the world. The American Revolution, for example, is no longer to be studied as an isolated event, resulting from British injustice. On the contrary, it should be placed in its true light as one phase of a larger revolution against kingly usurpation—in order that the young citizens who study it may realize more fully the importance of our world relations and our world responsibilities.

RE - AMERICANIZED EDITION, 1924: *Recent events have demonstrated that our teaching of history should emphasize more than ever before the peculiar and characteristic genius of American institutions, and the permanent and outstanding assets of American democracy. In this text book the author has kept in view the purpose of present-day teaching of American history and government; that is the preparation of pupils for intelligent, helpful citizenship, through the study of our country's history, its ideals and institutions. The aim is to present high ideals of American citizenship and political conduct, and to foster loyalty to the best American traditions.*

Muzzey, Hart, Everett Barnes, McLaughlin and Van Tyne, quite as feverously as Guitteau, have been revising and re-revising their objectionable texts—Muzzey five times in seven years—in efforts to eliminate the objectionable features and restore the truth. Corrections of more than one thousand, four hundred state-

ments and omissions already have been made in these six texts.

Every correction is a confession of bunk and bosh abjured.

Four other texts attacked—West's, Ward's, O'Hara's and Greenlaw's—have been junked.

It might seem that this is decisive victory and complete vindication and restoration of American spirit in the history-teaching in the public schools. But not so. For few of the "corrected" texts are acceptable. Several of them, coming back into common use, still retain their alien spirit. Moreover, in many thousands of communities the uncorrected editions of these texts still remain in use, and will remain in use, until aroused local protests shall have forced them entirely out.

A petition addressed to the Chicago Board of Education in the Spring of 1927 by a committee of Chicago citizens, complaining against histories in use, fell into the hands of Superintendent William McAndrew, and was by him withheld from the Board until after that body had acted upon his own recommendation for readoption of the texts for the ensuing year. Superintendent McAndrew had already come under patriotic fire for having caused "the Spirit of '76" and other patriotic pictures to be taken down from all schoolroom walls. William Hale Thompson, becoming a candidate for mayor of that city, placed the matter before the

people and it became the chief issue in the campaign, which resulted in Thompson's election by a tremendous plurality. Proceedings that were at once started in the Board of Education for the dismissal of Superintendent McAndrew and the expulsion of all Anglicized text books from the public school system are still in progress as these pages go to press. Voluminous evidence introduced in the McAndrew trial has disclosed a vast net-work of imperialistic, capitalistic, scholastic and pacifist influences in support of the treason texts. The garbled and false reports of this trial, given to the public of the nation, have shown that the daily press, the magazines, the pulpit and the lecture platform have largely come under control of the same influences.

The defense that has been offered by the Anglicized authors has not been marked with any high order of scholarship. It has consisted chiefly in evasion of specific complaints against their texts, of vague generalizations and theorizings, vainful boastings of their own scholastic attainments, and crude denunciation of their critics as pitifully ignorant, patriotically prejudiced and narrowly nationalistic.

Every defense attempted continues to recoil into mere confession. Prof. David S. Muzzey, author of *American History Revised*, in venturing to reply to the charges brought against his book before the Board of Education at Washington, D. C., said:

"The World War made a great change in many phases of our history. That is the reason for the revision of my book."

This same "reason" is given by several of the revisionists in their prefaces. But can it be any real reason for changing truths of the past which have been under the sacred seal of the word of honor of our fathers for the last century and a half?

The World War made many and great changes. But it could not possibly change the true facts regarding the American Revolution and the founding of our Republic. In all the Briticized revisions our colonial heroes are defamed, our republican principles distorted, the provocations for the Revolution confused and belittled, the achievements and prestige of our Nation minimized or ignored and the true meaning and spirit of our democratic ideals and institutions deadened to our children in the schools.

America's part in the World War could not alter, but could only vindicate and exalt, the true American tradition by which our people were inspired to enter and decide an old-world conflict, not primarily our own cause, and in which we exacted no gain or advantage except the doubtful promise that the world might be made safe for democracy. We went in to take American ideals to Europe, not to bring back European imperialism to America.

How can anything our Nation did in the World War change John Hancock from a great patriot leader to a mere "smuggler," while transforming Benedict Arnold from a detested traitor to an injured hero with a half page of praise?

The World War, cataclysmic as it was, could not turn the great truths that are immortalized in the Declaration of Independence into a tissue of falsehoods.

Such defense is weaker than direct confession.

The Anglicized authors are naively defending themselves still, just as they have been doing for the last seven years, by pleading that the complaints against their books are a reflection upon the thousands of teachers who use them.

If there is reflection upon teachers in the complaints against the treason texts, who is to blame? It is amazing that teachers should perfunctorily teach such falsifications of our annals and defamations of our nation-makers, to impressionable children, with no thought of impropriety and no realization that this is not stimulating, but deadening, to the spirit of American citizenship.

Scores of British propaganda passages have persistently been pointed out in the Muzzey text and others, which superintendents, principals and teachers, who, being directly in daily contact with the texts and directly responsible for the quality of teachings in the public

schools, should have been the first to detect and denounce, but which they, under the spell of insidious organized propaganda, are the last to be made to see.

It is for the teachers to remove any reflection upon themselves by discarding the treason texts. Otherwise, it is for school board officials, answerable to a patriotic public, to discard the treason teachers as well as the treason texts.

Authors and texts have had their chief defense come from England.

The *Spectator* of London, for one example, has been bitterly deploring that

“investigations in New York and other cities and several entire states have resulted in the condemnation of our best text books there.”¹

“This text book agitation” is denounced by this leading London review as “the lucubrations of malicious trouble-breeders and their narrow-minded dupes,” and a “phase of anti-British intrigue in the United States which has gained portentous headway.”

The protests against the altered texts “proceed,” the *Spectator* declares, “from the dark abysses of vulgar and insolent ignorance,” from “sentimentalists” and “unlettered demagogues.”

Anathema is pronounced by this loyal British journal against all American patriotic organizations as

¹ The *Spectator*, Sept. 1., 1923, pp. 278-9.

“societies which exist solely for the preservation of patriotic traditions and batten on the clap-trap of patriotism, and whose aptitude for flag-waving exceeds their perspicacity.”

The *Landmark*, of London, the official organ of the English-Speaking Union, has long been extolling the Anglicized histories and historians as “scholarly, impartial and truthful.”

The *Landmark* condemns American history as it has been accepted for a century and a half, as “essentially false, purile, ridiculous and withal dangerous.”

This official spokesman for the greatest of the hands-across-the-sea societies has been depicting the American patriotic organizations as “indulging in a flag-waving variety of country love” and “obsessed of the outgrown patter about such subjects as Bunker Hill, the Boston Tea Party and the Declaration of Independence.”²

Brilliantly illuminating is all this as to British interest and attitude, though it lends poor light to true history and darkly shadows amity.

There appears to prevail in England as well as here the delusion that defamation of American patriots and patriotism, not only of the past but of the present, is somehow magically conducive to Anglo-American accord.

² The *Landmark*, October, 1923.

Such clear manifestation of British interest and active interference in a matter so strictly American as the teaching of our own country's history, to our own children, in our own public schools, surely compels thoughtful consideration.

British journalism and British historical scholarship are not ashamed to be patriotic. British history is staunchly British. No modern nation has better builded its history to the high ends of national pride, morale and cohesion than Great Britain. It is her right and her glory; no complaint is laid against British history, in its place, and no conspiracy is hatched here to alter it; but the place for British history of the American Revolution is *not* in the public schools of the United States.

There has been no patriotic demand or desire here that any foreign nation be discredited or misrepresented in our school histories, or that any new nationalistic spirit be generated, or that there be made any alterations whatsoever in the long-accepted teachings of our annals. The sole demand has been that American history and American national spirit, precisely as they have developed through the past, be preserved.

XIV.

MUZZEY IN FULL RETREAT

*Text "Corrected" Five Times in Seven Years
and Still Under Nation-Wide Patriotic Ban*

PROFESSOR DAVID SAVILLE MUZZEY'S high school text, *An American History*, has been reprinted five times in the last seven years, in cunning efforts to dodge the complaints against it. These five so-called "corrected" editions, coming one after another, constitute confession after confession by the author and his publishers that the book could not be defended as it was. Neither can it now be defended as it is.

Professor Muzzey's entire account of the Revolutionary War, which made America a free nation, is compressed into nine and a half pages, in a book of 600 pages; while his account of the single Battle of Quebec of 1759, which made Canada British, is elaborated into three pages, with a full-page map, a quarter-page picture and a quarter-page footnote.

In this glorification of British victory and conquest more than a half-page is devoted to picture and panegyric of "Wolfe, young, brave, accomplished, tender," and "the courteous, valorous Montcalm;" although there is failure to appear in this book even the names of such

American heroes as Generals Wayne, Stark, Putnam, Sullivan, Knox, Gansevoort and Light Horse Harry Lee, or Commodores Barry, Decatur, Bainbridge, Hull and Porter, or Nathan Hale, Sergeant Jasper, Mollie Pitcher, or Betsey Ross and the birth of the flag.

It may not be possible or desirable that a high school history text should discuss in detail all the battles, all the heroic characters, all the oppressions resisted, all the ideals, principles, sacrifices and triumphs upon which our free republic was founded in the midst of a world of monarchy. But it is possible and essential that pupils in our public schools shall be taught that our free institutions are a treasure which our fathers bought at great price in struggle and suffering. It is possible and essential that our youth in every school grade should learn of the heroism, high character and exalted ideals of the men who founded our republic, and learn this in sufficient detail to insure admiration for them and to inspire impulse for emulation.

Professor Muzzey has been severely arraigned for his many omissions of characters and events that are essential to true American history. Far more severely must he be arraigned for his constant distortions, perversions and outright falsifications of the men, issues and events he does deal with.

In the 1920 Muzzey the opening paragraph treating of the American Revolution reads thus:

"This great event has too often been represented as the unanimous uprising of a downtrodden people to repel the deliberate unprovoked attack of a tyrant upon their liberties; but when thousands of people in the colonies could agree with a noted lawyer of Massachusetts that the Revolution was a 'causeless, wanton, wicked rebellion,' and thousands of people in England could applaud Pitt's denunciation of the war against America as 'barbarous, unjust and diabolical,' it is evident that, at the time at least, there were two opinions as to Colonial rights and British oppression."—p. 90.

So severe and so general was the complaint against this statement that in his first "corrected" edition Muzzey largely changed the wording of it, in order, as he said, to make his meaning clear. But the clearer his meaning the more odious it became; and from his later editions it has been eliminated. Yet the false and odious meaning still remains in succeeding statements.

Nowhere in his book, even now, does Professor Muzzey teach that the right opinion was that of the colonists. On the contrary, he directly leads on to further doubt and confusion. In presenting the issues upon which opinion was divided, he still is teaching:

"When we review, after a century and a half, the chain of events which changed the loyal British-Americans of 1763 into rebels in arms against their king in 1775, we see that the cause of the Revolution was a difference of opinion as to the nature of the British Empire."—p. 106.

That "there were two opinions" and "a difference of opinion" is true enough—bromidic—platitudinous. Without two conflicting opinions there never could be war.

But now, in the 1925 edition, the "difference of opinion" is confined entirely among the colonists. It is now all in the paragraph under the caption "The Colonists' View of Their Rights."

When Professor Muzzey proceeds in a paragraph under the caption, "The British View," any difference of opinion vanishes:

"With few exceptions, public men in England failed to see that the American colonies had any ground for complaint. . . . It was universally agreed that no country of Europe had a more liberal colonial trade policy than England. As to the charters they were royal favors, creating trade corporations with certain powers of self-government (like a city charter), but not intended, of course, to exempt the grantees from the supreme authority of the state. That authority was the Parliament, in which the American subjects of his Majesty were, like the great mass of English subjects, represented by the Commons."—p. 107.

Thus ends the section that gives the British view, without hint of dispute or difference of opinion, and with no confusion at all of the British side of the contention.

And later (p. 115), Professor Muzzey reverts to the

colonists' cause and still further questions, confuses and discredits it by stating:

"The Tories or Loyalists were champions of one side of a debatable question, namely, whether the abuses of the King's ministers justified armed resistance, but after the Declaration, loyalty to the King of Great Britain became treason to their country."
—p. 115.

On what grounds can it be contended that such doubts and questionings of the cause of the patriots are not just as treasonable today as they were then? They are all the more damnably that when taught in our schools.

These insistent statements that there were two opinions, at the time at least (in the colonies), as to colonial rights and British oppression; that after a century and a half we see that this difference of opinion (in the colonies) was merely as to the nature of the British empire; that it was a debatable question (in the colonies) whether the British abuses justified armed resistance; and leaving the whole question as an unsettled one today, offer a complete demonstration of the "new tendencies" in historical writing, against which patriotic protest is aroused.

In his later so-called "corrected" editions Professor Muzzey has modified "a debatable question" to "a much-debated question." Just what difference this is supposed to make is not perceivable. The objection to his whole string of statements is that it creates doubt as to

the clean-cut and practical idealism of the causes of the Revolution, and that he obliterates or obscures the really vital doctrines and principles upon which our independence was fought for and our republic founded.

Of the Boston Tea Party Professor Muzzey was teaching in 1920:

"The Boston Tea Party was the last straw. The colonies had added insult to disobedience. The outraged king called upon Parliament for severe measures of punishment."—p. 102.

He was charged then with presenting the British, not the American, view. He has been tinkering at this in futile efforts to make it appear corrected, but the most he does is confess it was, and is, the British view, for in his two latest revisions he says, p. 102:

"In King George's eyes, the 'Boston Tea Party' was the last straw; the colonies had added insult"—

not to "disobedience," as before, but to "injury." It is no longer "the outraged king," but just "the king," who called upon Parliament for punishment.

As if this had bettered the statement!

Professor Muzzey teaches in his 1920 edition, p. 118:

"Thus the American Revolution, after the victory at Saratoga, developed into a coalition of four powers against Great Britain; and the American

continent became again, for the fifth time within a century, the ground on which France and England fought out their mighty duel."

He now has modified his wording but not his meaning on page 119 of his 1925 edition.

Such belittlement of the War of the Revolution, as merely incidental to the European conflict, is utterly unjustifiable. American youth should be taught clearly that the colonists had their own just cause for waging their own war, and that they did wage it as their own war, with whatever help they could get, to a successful conclusion. There is no more important fact in American history than this. Attempt in school teachings to discredit or obscure it certainly is reprehensible.

At the conclusion of his chapter on the Revolution Professor Muzzey assigns to pupils "Topics for Special Reports" on "English Opinions of the American Cause," and the first authority he recommends is Dr. Samuel Johnson. Now, it is a notorious fact that Dr. Johnson, the most highly degreed and decorated scholar of his day, was hired by the British government, as an official propagandist, to revile and villify the cause of the colonists. There is ample official British record of that. Dr. Samuel Johnson, hired British propagandist, whose scurrilous opinions of the colonists' cause are recommended by Muzzey to American high school pupils, as the first authority, was the outstanding example of the

“higher scholarship” and “scientifically exact methods,” etc., of his day.

But there is this to be said for the hired Dr. Johnson, in contrast to some of the “higher scholarship” propagandists of today: His lying was at least in loyalty to his own country, and not against it.

Of the treaty of peace concluding the Revolution, Professor Muzzey’s 1920 edition had it (p. 153):

“The Commissioners, following Jay’s advice, disobeyed Congress, violated the treaty of alliance with France, and concluded the peace with England alone, thereby securing the whole territory from the Atlantic to the Mississippi.”

In the five statements in this one sentence there are five falsehoods.

It was not “Jay’s advice” that influenced the commissioners to negotiate separately from France.

There was no disobeying of Congress, for that body had no power to “instruct” the four commissioners, who were selected to represent four different sections of the colonies.

There was no “violation of the treaty of alliance with France,” for that treaty contained no provision for joint negotiations of peace. What it provided was that neither would make peace with Britain until the other was ready, and then only on the basis of American independence and retention of all occupied territory.

Our commissioners did not "conclude the peace with England alone," but made only a preliminary draft. France agreed to our definitive treaty before it was signed; and France, Spain and the United States signed on the same day, while Holland had signed the day before.

Alike false is the fifth statement—that this peace secured for us the whole territory from the Atlantic to the Mississippi. It did not include Florida and Louisiana, which Spain retained, nor the posts along our northern border, which the British held until after the Jay treaty of 1794.

For seven years there was persistent hammering at Professor Muzzey's hard head with these facts. Five falsehoods—mind you—in one sentence. And is this right, or was Muzzey right? The answer may be left to Professor Muzzey himself, in his latest "corrected" edition. He now says (p. 128):

"Owing to the complications of the *French-Spanish* alliance, our commissioners found it necessary to *exercise their own discretion* and to *negotiate* with the English agents alone, with whom they agreed upon a *preliminary treaty of peace*, securing for the United States the whole *eastern basin of the Mississippi*."

Quite different, isn't it?

No longer any of "Jay's advice." No longer any disobeying of Congress. No longer "violation of the treaty

of alliance with France." No longer do our commissioners "conclude the peace with England alone," but merely "negotiated a preliminary treaty." No longer, all the territory east of the Mississippi secured by this treaty, but only its own "eastern basin."

Is not such complete stultification as this simply astonishing?

What could Professor Muzzey have meant by all that fictitious fol-de-rol of 1920? If he knows American history, what could he have meant but to defame and degrade America, through what his 1925 edition confesses were gross falsifications of the facts?

And not even yet has Professor Muzzey touched upon the vital truth as to why there were separate negotiations. The simple fact is that the fixed policy of the British government required that our colonial commissioners must negotiate through the British Colonial Office, while the French had to treat through the British Foreign Office. This is reason enough for separate negotiations, and leaves no excuse for the fanciful fol-de-rol about it in a half-dozen Anglicized histories.

Professor Muzzey is still teaching (p. 128):

"The French Foreign Minister, Vergennes, felt aggrieved by this action, but was persuaded by Franklin to accept the terms."

Well, he was so "aggrieved" that within a few days he made a large French loan to the new-born nation!

Of the peace terms, Professor Muzzey teaches still:

“Europe was amazed at England’s generosity . . . It was a complete if a tardy triumph of that feeling of sympathy for men of common blood, common language, traditions and institutions across the seas.”—p. 130.

It surely must be suspected that a certain little affair at Saratoga, followed by a similar little affair at Yorktown—little affairs only in Muzzey’s history—had a good deal to do in causing British recognition of that feeling of sympathy for men of common blood, etc., across the seas. Europe has long ago recovered from any amazement it felt at England’s generosity.

In his account of the surrender at Yorktown Muzzey (p. 123) relates that 3000 French troops were landed, while Washington marched south with 2000 Americans and 4000 more Frenchmen and “cooped Cornwallis up.” By simple omission of the fact that nearly 8000 more Americans joined Washington in Virginia, impression is conveyed that it was mostly a French victory. This omission and false impression seem to have been designed. It is a part of the process by which Muzzey contrives to build up his theory that the American Revolution was merely a “mighty duel” between “France and England.”

Among the causes leading to the War of 1812, as related by Professor Muzzey, is this:

"The next move of the (American) administration was an attempt to bribe England and France to bid against each other for our trade."—p. 183.

School youths are likely to accept this assertion according to its clear import. It is not only false, but deadening to patriotic pride. It is not true American history but typical British propaganda.

"The unholy ambition of one man kept the civilized world in a turmoil during the first fifteen years of the nineteenth century and stirred war from the shores of Lake Erie to the steppes of Russia."—p. 180.

Here is more high-sounding, impressive phrasing suited to propaganda purposes. Big as it sounds, it is utterly too thin as to truth to spread over and cover from sight our own sufficient causes for the War of 1812. Napoleon and all his works aside, the United States had abundant and unquestionable grievances against Great Britain. To be sure, Muzzey slurs over these grievances; but they were real, and are still to be found in honest American histories.

The War of 1812, which solidified our new nation, established our right to the seas, confirmed our independence in the eyes of the world and developed our own national consciousness and character, is said by Professor Muzzey to have been:

"An unfortunate conflict between the sister nations of the English tongue."—p. 184.

"New England states protested against 'Mr. Madison's war,' (which they would better have called 'Mr. Clay's war'!)"—p. 186.

This author persistently minimizes and misstates American naval achievements in the War of 1812:

"Some 2000 prizes were captured, many of which were, however, retaken."—p. 187.

The British prizes taken were about 2500, and so remarkable was this achievement that it should not be understated. Quite different would be the impression conveyed were it stated that this achievement was made in spite of the fact that at the beginning of the war Great Britain had more than 1000 fighting ships while we had only seventeen.

"Before the war was over they were themselves paying 15 per cent insurance on vessels crossing the English Channel."—p. 187.

This means nothing to those not familiar with maritime insurance rates. The illumination comes of the fact that it was more than double the rate ever known by England before or since. At the same time she could not get any insurance at all between England and Ireland.

"At the close of the war all our frigates were either captured, sunk or interned."—p. 187.

Notably, two of our most famous fighting ships, the *President* and the *Constitution*, were not captured, sunk,

or interned. A month after the signing of the treaty, the President fought a British squadron of four ships, and later still the Constitution fought the Levant and the Cyane in one of the hottest naval battles of all history, capturing both.

“Americans were the worst sufferers by the war, their exports falling from \$110,000,000 in 1807 to \$7,000,000 in 1814.”—p. 187.

There is no fairness in comparing exports of 1807 with those of 1814 as showing result of the war. It was back in 1807 that our own Embargo Act, together with British and French depredations on our commerce, started ruin to our foreign trade. Before we went to war, England had seized 1000 of our merchant ships and France 500. The falling of exports cited by Muzzey was the cause of war rather than result of it. And even had all this loss been a result of the war, still it could not have made Americans “the worst sufferers by the war,” because British shipping seized outright amounted alone to more than this amount. Besides, there were compensating gains for us in the war, of incalculable value, and none for Great Britain.

Professor Muzzey was teaching in his 1920 edition that the Battle of New Orleans, though it served no good purpose, was “one of the bloodiest battles that ever was fought on American soil.”

It was patiently hammered into Muzzey’s head that

Antietam, Fredericksburg, Chancellorsville, Gettysburg, the Wilderness, Spottsylvania, Cold Harbor, Chickamauga and other battles of the Civil War were far bloodier than that of New Orleans. The professor finally saw the point, or thought he did, and in his 1922 correction made the passage read:

“The bloodiest battle that *had ever been* fought on American soil.”

More bludgeoning was called for to make this “scientifically exact” representative of “higher historical scholarship” see that he had stupidly blundered again. For Bunker Hill, Bennington, Braddock’s defeat and St. Clair’s defeat had all been bloodier in ratio to forces engaged; while even at Quebec, of which Muzzey makes so much, because it made Canada British, more had been killed and wounded than at New Orleans.

Now, in the edition of 1925, he has cleaned out all attempt at comparison, and says simply that Jackson

“drove them back with terrific slaughter, laying 2000 of their number on the field in a battle of twenty minutes’ duration.”—p. 188.

Surely this is more directly to the point, and true at last. But the distinctive and interesting fact about the bloodiness at New Orleans is its disparity. The British suffered more than 2,100 casualties and the Americans only 24. Professor Muzzey doesn’t give this interesting fact—probably doesn’t know it.

Now "corrected" also is Muzzey's 1920 statement that the British

"'Impressed' a good many real Americans among the suspected deserters. If resisted, he (British lieutenant) attempted to justify his behavior by the plea that it was practically impossible to tell Englishmen and Americans apart."—p. 181.

Nowadays, some Englishmen and Americans cannot tell themselves apart, and are readily impressed into British service, poor sailors though they be.

So, we must not permit ourselves to be unduly impressed by the vainful pretensions to "higher historical scholarship," "scientifically exact new methods," etc. Professor Muzzey simply does not know American history.

Patrick Henry's "liberty-or-death" speech, the most dynamic oration ever made on this continent, was in the Muzzey 1920 edition located in the Virginia House of Burgesses at Williamsburg. Even Professor Muzzey knows now, and has it in his latest edition, that this speech was made in a Virginia State convention at Richmond, after the House of Burgesses had been dissolved by the royal governor.

Of Fort Sumter even this latest edition is saying (p. 334):

"Anderson surrendered, saluting the tattered flag as he marched his half-suffocated garrison to the boats."

Sumter was not surrendered; it was evacuated merely; Anderson carried the flag with him, and it served as his winding-sheet at his burial.

In the single sentence given by Muzzey (1911, 1917, 1920) to the Saratoga surrender, he teaches that Burgoyne

“was brought to bay near Saratoga by the dashing charges of Arnold, Morgan and Schuyler.”—p. 118.

Schuyler had been relieved of command more than a month earlier, and was at his home below Albany.

Such inaccuracies are not inconsequential. They delude not only public school students of this text but also teachers and other authors of school history. Former Superintendent Corson of Newark, N. J., an ardent Muzzey partisan, has written a history text of his own for primary grades and, blindly accepting Muzzey as authority, teaches that

“General Schuyler, commanding the Americans, met Burgoyne at Saratoga and after a desperate battle compelled him to surrender.”—Corson: *Founders of Freedom in America*, p. 153.

Dr. Corson repeats also Muzzey's “liberty-or-death” blunder. Authorities are clear, and there is no excuse for such slovenly inaccuracy concerning two of the most crucial events in American history, whether the author be a “higher scholarship” historian or a school

superintendent, and whether the text be for high school or any other grade.

Prof. Muzzey refers to Lafayette as

“the most devoted of the eleven foreign major-generals of the American army.”—p. 122.

The foreign major-generals were only seven. Lafayette was splendidly devoted, but none could be more devoted than DeKalb who fell with eleven wounds at the head of his troops.

Contrasted is the fine fighting of frontiersmen with

“the skirmishes on the seaboard between uniformed soldiers commanded by officers in gold braid.”—p. 125.

There was not enough gold braid in the patriot army to discredit it in the least degree, but Dr. Muzzey misses no chance to cast sidelong leers at the patriots. Until forced to correction, he had derisively saddled the word, patriots, with quotation marks, as Dr. West still does.

More than thirty such stupid blunders, due to ignorance merely, as well as more than sixty falsifications, due to regulation propaganda design, have been more or less corrected by Muzzey in his five successive editions since 1920; but as many more still remain. Every correction he has made has been forced upon him.

The so-called corrections he has made are mostly

superficial concessions, made to an aroused public-opinion, to nation-wide patriotic protest, and to definite demands of enlightened boards of education. But his un-American spirit in the substance of his book remains unchanged. It is as dangerous and disastrous to American spirit in the schools today as ever it was, when its author and publishers themselves no longer dared defend it.

American apology to Britain in the Trent affair is said by Muzzey to have been acknowledgment of

“a high-handed outrage of the principle of the inviolability of vessels of neutral nations, for the defense of which we had gone to war with Great Britain in 1812.—p. 349.

Our naval officer had traversed our own doctrine of the sacred character of our decks at sea that led to the war of 1812, very true; while England's indignation was in direct antagonism to what England had practised for a thousand years in the claimed right of search. Our Secretary admitted the wrong and our government ordered restitution, not because we recognized the violation of international law in thus forcibly abducting open enemies from the decks of a power with which we were at peace, but because our captain did not seize the vessel and bring it into port for trial of the offenders. Seward's dispatch is one of the smoothest pieces of diplomatic writing ever done. With subtle ingenuity he argued a point almost imperceptible at first and made

his conclusion so obvious that there was no loss of dignity in his graceful retreat from an impossible situation. The Muzzey statement is not true.

Of the Monroe Doctrine this text teaches:

“With the entrance of the United States into the great World War, in April, 1917, and the conspicuous participation of our President in the adjustment of complicated problems at the Peace Conference at Paris, that part of the Monroe Doctrine which regards the world as divided into two separate and remote halves has been rendered obsolete.”—p. 208.

No part of the Monroe Doctrine ever regarded the world as divided into two separate and remote halves. All leaders here and abroad agree that in no sense has the force or meaning of the Monroe Doctrine been impaired. This was recognized in the Conference at Versailles. It has been re-emphasized by every department of our government.

Among all the “Anglo-American professors of history,” Professor Muzzey easily ranks first as scandal-monger and mud-slinger, but nearly always he presents his slanders as coming from somebody else.

In the latest edition Professor Muzzey teaches, page 112:

“To be sure, there were skeptical and ironical Tories in the colonies who declared that the protestations of loyalty in the petitions of Congress and in the mouths of the ‘patriots’ were only ‘the gold

leaf to conceal the treason beneath'; but it is hard to believe that men like Washington, Jefferson, Franklin and Jay were insincere in their public utterances."

True historians make this vital fact of sincerity not only "hard to believe" but impossible of doubt; but Professor Muzzey leaves the sincerity of the patriot leaders, like their oppressions, "a much-debated question."

"Boston Town Meetings were by the King's ministers called 'hotbeds of discussion and disobedience'."—p. 102.

Perhaps so. But what did the American patriots call them? What do honest historians call them? Professor Muzzey doesn't say.

"To King George's eyes the capital of Massachusetts was a center of vulgar sedition, strewn with brickbats and broken glass, where his enemies went about clothed in homespun and his friends in tar and feathers."—p. 102.

Were King George's the only eyes that Muzzey can see through? Clearly so, for there the paragraph ends.

"The more ardent of the Loyalists denounced the Congress in unmeasured terms as a collection of quarrelsome, pettifogging lawyers and mechanics."—p. 129.

Ardent patriots, who thought otherwise, get no hearing in Muzzey's book.

George Washington, on page 170, is "reviled in language fit to characterize a Nero." "Tyrant," "dictator," and "despot" are some of the epithets hurled at him. He is called the "stepfather of his country," and someone or other is said to have said that "the day was hailed with joy by the Republican press when this imposter should be 'hurled from his throne.'"

Professor Muzzey does not know American history and does not want to know it. All he knows is British history of America. What he knows is what he sees through King George's eyes; what the British ministry thought; what the Tories, Loyalists and traitors in the colonies had to say; what anonymous slanderers sneeringly whispered against great Americans.

"They said," "they said," "they said" is his ceaseless reiteration in villifying our great men and measures.

The meanest, most cowardly, most irresponsible slanderer on earth is that elusive liar called "They Said," and he is Professor Muzzey's most constant authority.

We already have seen what THEY SAID in vituperation of Washington, of the colonists in general, their Congress and their cause. The same sources continue to be drawn upon by Professor Muzzey for defamation of eminent Americans up to the present.

"It was even hinted by Hamilton's enemies that he had given his friends and political supporters

advance information that he was going to pay the full value of the certificates, and so enabled them to buy up the paper and make enormous profits out of the government.”—p. 160.

Of President William Henry Harrison, Professor Muzzey is teaching, page 243:

“A democratic paper in Baltimore made the sneering comment: ‘Give him a barrel of hard cider and settle \$2,000 a year on him, and he will sit the remainder of his days in his log cabin by the side of his fire studying moral philosophy.’”

President Andrew Jackson is described (p. 215) in the words of an unnamed authority as

“a tall, lank, uncouth-looking personage, with long locks of hair hanging over his face, and a cue down his back tied in an eel-skin.”

On page 228:

“His political enemies declared that he was wont to conduct himself more like an absolute ruler than like the sworn defender of a democratic constitution, and spoke of his presidency as “the reign of Andrew Jackson.”

“The Charleston Mercury came out in a flamboyant article against him, in which it declared: ‘An infuriated administration has been driven to the use of brute force. . . . If this republic has found a master, let us not live his subjects’.”—p. 241.

It is difficult to see how this is any more “flamboyant” in a newspaper article than in a school text. The parti-

san newspaper "yellow dog" has found a new kennel in school history.

Of President Adams and Henry Clay, page 216:

"They declared that the aristocratic Adams and Henry Clay, 'the Judas of the West,' had entered into a corrupt bargain."

Of President Van Buren, page 242:

"President Van Buren was an aristocratic New Yorker, a rich widower, who, according to campaign oratory, lived in solitary splendor at the White House, eating off golden plates and drinking costly wines from silver coolers."

Of the Dred Scott decision, p. 314:

"The Northern press spoke of 'sullied ermine' and 'judicial robes polluted in the filth of pro-slavery politics.'"

When has the press not been given to such habit of expression? When did such extreme utterances ever have real and lasting significance? Why should the fiercest shriekings of the yellow journals be selected for perpetuation and as interpretation of events in school history?

President Grant (p. 392) "as a statesman was untrained." Prior to the latest revision he was "pitiable." He still remains "unduly susceptible to the influence of men who made millions." In the next paragraph: "A more honest President never sat in the White House."

The school child may reason out whether here is an inconsistency or a sweeping indictment of all Presidents.

These typically illustrate the Muzzey system of characterization. His method of defaming great American characters and causes consists simply in attaching a stigma, usually by quotation of the severest epithet that contemporary opponents could have uttered, and which because of its violence is bound to impress itself indelibly in the memory of the school child. This crude method is applied monotonously, not only to great men but to classes and policies, throughout his text. It is the "yellow dog" in school history.

Perhaps the voluntary reader can stand some more of it. The children in the high schools have to stand it daily. Such is the ever-flowing spring of their patriotic inspiration.

President Hayes, p. 404:

"His face appeared in the Democratic press with the word 'Fraud' written across his brow."

"Others called him a 'goody-goody', a hypocrite and a 'Granny Hayes.'"

Of President Garfield, p. 410:

"Charles Guiteau, a 'stalwart' fanatic, crept up to the President and fired a bullet in his back. He did it, he said, to rid the country of a 'traitor'."

“‘The election of Wilson,’ said Theodore Roosevelt, “means that we are ready to accept any insult, even the murder of our women and children, if only we make money.”—p. 505.

Blaine was “unreliable.” (p. 413)

“The sharp-tongued Conkling, being invited to take the stump for Blaine in 1884, replied, “Thank you, I don’t engage in criminal practice.”—p. 414.

“Chase (p. 367) was a very able man—‘about one and a half times bigger than any man I’ve known,’ Lincoln said once; but,” adds Muzzey:

“he was also very pompous and conceited and needed little persuasion to believe that he was indispensable to the country’s salvation.”

Here is a rare instance of quotation of striking phrase in a great man’s favor, but Professor Muzzey’s own opinion promptly smothers that of Lincoln.

Of another popular idol of his day:

“Douglas was denounced as a turn-coat, a traitor, a Judas, a Benedict Arnold, who had sold himself to the South for the presidential election.”—p. 303.

Again, on page 316, of Douglas:

“The South assailed him as a ‘traitor’ and a ‘renegade’ and a ‘Judas’, the very epithets with which he had been branded in the North four years earlier.”

Thaddeus Stevens appears in the Muzzey text, not as the father of the American high school system, which he was, but only as

“the violent, vindictive Stevens.”—p. 398.

On the same page and indeed in the same sentence appear

“the unspeakable demagogue Butler, the visionary Sumner and the proud, uncompromising partisan, Conkling.”

So commonly does Professor Muzzey resort to this process that the text bristles with quotation marks and reeks with long-decayed filth, but seldom does he quote striking phrase in favor of any man or policy American.

The good in these men, that might better be taught in school, is wanting in this text.

Professor Muzzey seems to have a fixed delusion that political and commercial corruptions have played a larger part in our national achievements than have honest endeavors and orderly system. Not occasionally, but repeatedly and insistently, his text impresses upon the student mind notions of capitalistic criminality in control of government and in monopoly of natural resources.

“Congress and the courts,” somebody is said to have feared,

"had become corrupted by association with the moneyed men of the country."—p. 227.

There is supposed to have been

"a rebuke to the 'corrupt' manipulation of Congress, which had seated Adams in the Presidential chair."
—p. 227.

It is assumed to be significant that a politician

"poured out his wrath on the leaders of the preceding administration for 'crooked politics,' 'corrupt bargains,' jobbery and underhand methods."

Another politician, in overwrought state of mind, is quoted as declaring that the only way to preserve the Union was

"to resist the economic tyranny of the manufacturing states, which had got control of Congress."

That this assertion was at once effectively answered and that it has been by subsequent history thoroughly disproved is not mentioned in the text.

"Our state legislatures and municipal governments fell into the hands of corrupt 'rings'."—p. 395.

Some did; but the statement indicates that all did, which is untrue. It is fairly typical of the Muzzey style, which too often is loose. Regarding capitalistic corruptions and political knaveries there usually is sensational overstatement. Both attitude and phrasing of the "soap-box orator" are incorporated in this school history.

"Members of Congress so far lost their sense of official propriety as to accept large amounts of railroad stock as 'a present' from men who wanted legislative favors for their roads."—p. 395.

Some did. The natural inference here is that all did. The two members most conspicuously involved are later in this text fully exonerated and pronounced honest men. Thus the odium is shifted to the hundreds of members who were never even accused and presumably were innocent. It is another instance of demagogic railing; it is not history-writing. Next appears

"the taint of that corruption which seemed to pervade every field of public activity during Grant's administration." . . . "That honest men, like Vice President Colfax and James A. Garfield, accepted this stock without investigating its origin only proves how low was the general moral tone of public life."—p. 399.

Perhaps high school students are better logicians than Muzzey and will perceive that this "only proves," on the contrary, that the situation might not have been as bad as the partisan outcry of the time and Muzzey's loose repetition of it cause it to appear.

"Political offices were the prizes of intriguing politicians and wire-pullers. . . . Republicans and Democrats brought against each other the charge of 'insatiable lust for office'—and both were right."—p. 410.

Here again are sweeping statements that involve all

and assert finality. Yet, the condition which is here overstated, as one peculiar to a particular period, always was and always will be inseparable from popular government. Office-seeking is not assumably an evil in a republic. Curiously enough, the Muzzey hero, to whom is given more praise than to all others in this text, was the most inveterate office-seeker of our time. Not that there is discredit to Theodore Roosevelt in that the main occupation of his life-time was to seek to serve the public. Quite to the contrary, we can immeasurably contribute toward better government by teaching our future citizenry not that public office is a place of corruption and shame, which only selfishly-designing ones seek and are discredited for the mere seeking, but that it is a place for high service and for honorable distinction, and is rightfully to be sought and worthily gained for upright purposes. The public schools, more than any other agency, can purify politics. This is to be achieved not by impressing upon the minds of future citizens the worst of the rottenness of men and methods of the past, as regular practice, but by impressing instead true and lasting conceptions of the best that has evolved out of our experience as to qualities of leadership, tried principles, tested ideals and fixed duties of citizenship. If better minds are to be developed and stimulated to more intelligent and active interest and control in public affairs, there must be presented those elements in public service which young minds-in-the-

making can comprehend, appreciate and desire to emulate. It is no inviting picture which is all shadow.

"The campaign was perhaps the most bitter and disgraceful of all our history, conducted, as the Nation remarked, 'in a spirit worthy of the stairways of a tenement house'."—p. 414.

"In the opinion of half the country they had 'stolen' the election of 1876 and were generally accused of having 'bought' the election of 1880."—p. 415.

"It needed only a leader to unite them into a compact army against the 'money lords' of Wall Street, who, they believed, had loaded their farms with mortgages and purchased legislatures and courts to thwart the people's will."—p. 443.

"It was a bitter battle between the Western plowholder and the Eastern bondholder." . . . "It signaled the victory in the Republican party of the business 'power behind the throne' of government." . . . "'Lunacy dictated the platform,' said a Democratic paper, 'and hysteria evolved the candidate'." —p. 448.

The monotony of method and the accumulation of slanders become tiresome. In no case do these quoted stigmas contribute to fair characterization; they make fair estimate impossible. The cumulative effect upon the young student must be a deep impression that politics and government are a system of chicane, and that leadership is attained only through some sort of scoundrelism and base schemings.

A good teacher may do much toward correcting these crudities; but at the same time it must clearly appear that a teacher who is capable of rightly interpreting such cases would be the last to select such a text as this.

It is readily to be realized by the adult that most of the invidious and iconoclastic utterances that have been quoted had their origin solely in the minds of partisan agitators, wrought to highest key of frenzy, and caring less for fact than for effective phrases to serve fleeting campaign purposes. Such as ever had fair basis can retain little that is of right educative value today, presented in these extravagant, one-sided statements. The effect must be not to enlighten and broaden the mind of the student but to debase and harden it, in spite of the perfect teacher.

The human faults, weaknesses and failings are common to us all. They are the mere dross of history, and have no educative value. The outstanding virtues and attainments, that have made men strong in character and great in achievement, are the gold of history. The text book that teaches youth the vices and not the virtues, the mean hatreds, jealousies and slanders and not the fine admirations; the failings through error but not the inspiring successes through righteous endeavor—such is not history, but muck-raking. It is not a help, but a hindrance, to character-building for good citizenship.

Our nation has a splendid record of admirable char-

acters, sound principles, righteous policies and unparalleled achievements, that would fill a book ten thousand times as big as Professor Muzzey's text, which carps from start to finish upon the petty faults of men.

Shall we permit our glorious record, our source of national pride, inspiration, strength and guidance, to perish with the present generation, through false teachings in the schools? If we can permit this to perish, we already are fitted for the national degradation and disintegration that must inevitably follow.

To betray our sacred truths is basest infamy.

American patriotism, awakened, informed and united, must prove itself predominant over intrigue and treason. American spirit still is sovereign. Not only in our public schools but in every patriot heart must be revived and re-enshrined the inspiring annals and exalting ideals of Americanism, which insure increasing liberty and prestige to ourselves and our children and continuing light and progress to the world.

XV.

“MILLIONS AT STAKE”

*Interlocking Directorates Between Text-Book
Publishing Firm and Seven Alien Agencies*

THERE clearly appears direct and pernicious connection of Ginn & Co., the publishers of the Muzzey history, with numerous pro-British and pacifist propaganda organizations. This concern is foremost in the cunningly-designed and heavily financed scheme to denationalize American school children through falsified histories in our public schools.

In a school board investigation of the Muzzey history at Danville, Ill., a member of the firm of Ginn & Co. declared that “there are millions of dollars at stake in this contest, and our defense is on that basis.” The same was declared by another Ginn representative in the investigation of Muzzey at Newark, N. J. There is, of course, nothing like millions of dollars involved in the Muzzey text-book alone. What millions are involved, how and why they are involved, and whose they are, shall be seen. The connections to be cited are fully confirmed in the *New York Directory of Directors*, the *New York Co-Partnership Directory* and the rosters of the various organizations named.

Second only to Columbia University, where three of

the Carnegie bureaus are quartered, the home of Ginn & Co., 70 Fifth Ave., New York, is the largest breeding-nest and roosting-place in America of Anglo-American and pacifist organizations. Clustered in the home of Ginn & Co., and officered to a great extent by members of the Ginn firm, are these closely related agencies:

World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship Through the Churches,
World Peace Foundation,
American Association for International Co-operation,
League of Nations Union,
League of Nations Non-Partisan Association,
New York Peace Society,
New York Union for International Justice,
World Court League.

The millions amassed by the late Edward Ginn out of text books in American schools have heavily endowed these alien and pacifist organizations that now assist in the efforts to force British versions of the history of our country upon our children in the public schools.

Most of these organizations also share in the \$300,000,000 fund of Carnegie, who declared his fondest dream was of "the Re-United State—the British-American Union." Not one of these organizations even pretends to be straight-out American. They decry American nationalism as "narrow" and "bigoted" and

misled by the history we have accepted for a century and a half, which they pronounce "essentially false, ridiculous, puerile and withal dangerous." All issue enormous quantities of insidious propaganda, Bolshevik as well as British, clearly designed to undermine Americanism.

These eight organizations named are so closely knit together, in a single purpose, that one man, C. H. Levermore, was, until he died the other day, secretary of them all. Levermore was the distinguished professional pro-British propagandist whose "World Peace Plan," under which the destinies of our great republic would be turned over to British control, was sensationally foisted upon public attention by means of the \$100,000 prize put up in the name of Edward Bok, a Dutchman Anglicized.

That the activities of these alien agencies are not escaping observation at our national capital is disclosed in the following Washington correspondence of Arthur Sears Henning in the *Chicago Tribune*, July 13, 1927:

"Our country is being swamped in a tidal wave of pacifist propaganda, disseminated by fifty organizations expending approximately \$3,000,000 a year. These organizations are working in various ways for world peace and the abolition of war, but the majority of them are also working to weaken the military preparedness of the United States for national defense.

"The more radical of these organizations are now concentrating, like the Socialists and communists and some of the church organizations. . .

"The pacifists and radicals have taken a leaf from the communist manual of tactics in their propaganda campaigns to mold American public opinion and influence legislation. . .

"With some of their objectives identical, though pursued from diverse motive, with a bond of sympathy uniting them as champions of change and with their propaganda organizations interlocking in varying degrees with each other through common directors—with these relations existing, the pacifists and radicals are 'boring from within' the churches, schools and colleges, labor unions, women's clubs and other organizations. As they gain headway in these institutions they are able to bring a more and more powerful influence to bear on the legislative, executive and judicial branches of the government."

George A. Plimpton, senior member of Ginn & Co., is a trustee of the World Peace Foundation, the head of which is Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University. Ginn's and Carnegie's millions founded and sustain the World Peace Foundation, which is designed to disarm America by destroying patriotic spirit and inculcating national pusillanimity in the name of peace.

"King George" Plimpton, head of Ginn & Co., is a trustee and the treasurer of Barnard College, Columbia University, which employs Professor Muzzey to teach Anglicized history to its students, while Ginn & Co.

employs him to teach it through a text book to school children all over the land.

School authorities everywhere have been deluged with statements made by President Butler and other Columbia Professors favorable to the treason texts, especially Muzzey's; and this institution in which the senior member of Ginn & Co. is paymaster has been sending its professorial puppets everywhere about over the country to defend the treason texts in school board investigations.

In behalf of the Muzzey history, to sustain it against the nation-wide attack of the patriotic societies, a most intensive propaganda is carried on and a most powerful machine operated for the seduction, or else intimidation and coercion, of public school superintendents, principals and teachers. Exerting their fullest force in this propaganda and coercion are all the Carnegie agencies quartered at Columbia and all the pro-British and pacifist organizations housed under the Ginn roof.

It was Dean Henry Johnson of Teachers' College, Columbia, who conceived and dictated to teachers' conventions all over the land the resolutions in which for the last ten years public school teachers have servilely accepted Anglicized history. This apparent demand from teachers played a large part in deluding other publishers into following the lead of Ginn & Co., in issuing treason texts.

Columbia University, with its Teachers' College, Barnard College and other departments, in close co-operation with Ginn & Co., the three Carnegie bureaus of which Butler is the head, and a dozen more British, pacifist and Bolshevik agencies exercise in every State a powerful undercurrent of influence in the selection of public school superintendents and the advancement of principals and teachers.

Nothing is more commonly known throughout the American public school system than the shameful fact that countless superintendents and principals secure appointments through these influences, not to keep faith with the public that employs and trusts them, but to serve the business interests of Ginn & Co., and the political designs of its allied foreign agencies.

The recognized practices of seduction, intimidation and coercion of superintendents, principals and teachers by Ginn & Co., and its organized alien allies and Anglo-American college presidents and professors is a loathsome and deadly ulcer upon the public school system.

"King George" Plimpton, head of Ginn & Co., is a trustee and the paymaster of the Church Peace Union, which has \$2,000,000 of Carnegie's money and much of Ginn's, and the purpose of which is pulpit exchange between preachers of this country and England. Our ministers are taken over there to be Anglicized and

inducted into pro-British organizations, while English ministers are sent over here to preach the gospel of British-American union.

The World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship Through the Churches, which is headquartered at Canterbury Cathedral in England, shares in the Carnegie and Ginn funds. Usually secret in its operations, it came into the limelight when some twenty of its American committeemen, all of them exchanged preachers, cabled, telegraphed or wrote to President Harding, appealing "for the sake of world peace," that he rush the American army and navy to the support of Great Britain at the Dardanelles; and the same gang later has been devilishly busy urging America into misunderstandings in China in British interests. For this sort of "peace" propaganda, in the sacred name of the churches, the paymaster is "King George" Plimpton, head of Ginn & Co., and treasurer of the American branch of this World Alliance.

Such are some of the more notorious pro-British agencies and personages that are allied with Ginn & Co. in the "millions-at-stake" determination to maintain Muzzey's treason text in the American public schools, in contempt and defiance of the clearly-declared and unanimous protest of American patriotic societies and the enlightened loyal sentiment of the entire nation.

On the other hand, at stake are the sacred rights of

the millions of children of self-governing freemen to be protected in the public schools against illusion and imposture, to have the truth of our nation's past, to drink from its springs unpolluted the inspirations to loyalty and good citizenship, and be fitted to continue the independence and splendid progress and increasing prestige of our Republic.

By direct links the college system of our country is tied up with the Carnegie institutions, Ginn & Co., and their alien organizations. Members of Ginn & Co. are strategically planted in college trusteeships — Lewis Parkhurst at Dartmouth, Charles H. Thurber at Clark, etc., while Plimpton is upon the boards of Barnard, Amherst, Union Theological Seminary and even the faraway Women's College at Constantinople. Through such links, the foreign imperialistic and international banking interests control the policies and personnel of many colleges.

Against such control of endowed colleges the public may be helpless. But as to the public schools the people have the power, and must become aroused in spirit to resent, resist and cast off the baleful domination.

The strictest monitor and staunchest bulwark of our national spirit is our true history. A warned, awakened and aroused people must not suffer its perversion and destruction at the hands of pro-British agencies.

XVI.

“THE INTERNATIONAL MIND”

*It Is Always the British Mind—Our Nation's
Richest Asset is Its Unsullied History*

THE fixed and proved purpose of the dozen or more British propaganda associations pussy-footing among us is to deaden our respect for our own birthright, inoculate us with contempt for our own free institutions, and fit us for coercion or recolonization.

One medium, now fully exposed, is the Anglicized school history, taught to American children.

American patriotism everywhere must take vigilant guard at the school door. The American school histories which have been altered through intrigue and treason must be cast out if America is to remain American.

All the annals of the rise and fall of nations teach us clearly that the peoples who cease to preserve and perpetuate the spiritual treasures and patriotic ideals of their past must inevitably decay into dissolution or sink in subjugation.

The history teachings implanted in the minds and hearts of our children are the seed of their citizenship. The ideals and inspirations of childhood become the

purposes and achievements of manhood and womanhood.

The glorious principles and triumphs of our heroic forefathers may be immortalized only through the pride, appreciation, fidelity and full worthiness of their posterity.

The ideals, principles and traditions descended to us from that heroic period are a proud heritage, to be held by us sacredly in trust and transmitted unimpaired to our children.

This trust is being betrayed. This cleanest, most unselfish, most virile and rightly inspiring history that any nation has, or ever had, in the world, is insidiously being destroyed through foreign influences and in interests that are alien to America.

The soul of Benedict Arnold still survives, enacts again its shameful surrender to alien seductions, and has approbation from the same sources as of old. The spirit that betrayed our country in the hour of its birth seeks to betray it now in the day of its steady ascendancy to world supremacy.

The renegade Arnold caused poisoning of the wells in patriot communities he ravaged, and the same spirit today poisons our spring-heads of patriotic inspiration and national morale. No other possible thought than this can come of the organized propaganda in history text

books to belittle, distort, falsify or suppress in our schools the virile principles, vital traditions and noble prestige of the American Republic, because of Britain's present need of our alliance.

We must defend our priceless heritage of peerless history. We must not let it go. It is as sacred as our flag. It is the cement of our solidarity. It is the soul of our national life. We need a revival of the spirit of '76, not its obscuratation.

The stealthy and shameful alteration of school histories is of course only one manifestation of the methods and aims of the many British propaganda agencies operating among us.

But this is a manifestation clearly definite, and through it may be interpreted the alien spirit and purpose in which are expended enormous funds and tremendous effort.

These alterations illustrate with startling clearness that "the international mind" sought to be established is always the British mind.

Revisionists who dismiss John Hancock as a "smugler," Thomas Jefferson as a "liar, atheist and demagogue," Patrick Henry as "gay, unprosperous and unknown," and Alexander Hamilton as one who held that "the people are a great beast" all in turn highly

laud British statesmen and English ideals as the really effective forces for freedom and democracy.

American national spirit suffers that British national spirit may directly benefit.

The sublime courage of the patriot militiamen at Bunker Hill, who resisted three times their number of trained British troops until their powder was gone, makes improper appeal to American youth, according to the "international mind," because it inculcates militant and nationalistic spirit; and so our children are taught instead that "British pluck triumphed."

The glory of Paul Jones' capture of the *Serapis* might stir improper admiration for American valor and undesired confidence in American achievement against heavy odds; and so school history has been changed to read that "The *Serapis* had the better of the fight and would have won," but for the "accidental" blowing up of its own powder magazine by a hand grenade thrown by one of Jones' men.

It is said that it is not good for our children to know and admire the indomitable courage and heroic sacrifices at Valley Forge; and so they are now taught instead that complainings and mutiny were rife and that "one in every five deserted." One revisionist teaches that it was felt at Valley Forge that "the English had only one king while the colonists had thirteen."

The international mind consistently holds the double idea of defaming America and exalting England.

To encourage "intellectual disarmament," American children must be denied knowledge of the brave and triumphant stand of Jackson and his 2,200 backwoodsmen against "the flower of the British army," 10,000 strong, at New Orleans, and be taught that "all the Americans had to do to win a victory was to hold their ground," while "the invaders came on like British soldiers, and like British soldiers they came again and again and offered up their lives for their king."

To the international mind there must be no devotion to country taught but that to England.

In the sacred name of world pacifism all militaristic glory must be dimmed but that of Britain. Any other "promotes narrow national self-esteem" and is "inimical to international good will."

From our school readers "The Ride of Paul Revere" is disappearing, but not "The Charge of the Light Brigade." Saratoga and Yorktown are being obscured, but never Trafalgar, Waterloo or the defeat of the Armada. There must be no courage or victory chronicled that is not English. Every laurel that can be snatched from American heroism is at once transferred to British heroism.

"The Star Spangled Banner," our inspiring national

anthem, must be given up for the sake of pacifist spirit, and superceded by the hymn in which the international-minded may join with "God Save the King!"

This "international good will" must not embrace France or Germany or Italy or China or any other nation than Britain. Ten Anglicized histories teach our children that French aid in the Revolution came only through selfish motives of revenge on England. The names of brave spirits of many lands that used to shine resplendently in our school histories, preserving in us widespread international sympathies, are now obliterated.

The "international mind" is British thoroughly. While insidiously seeking to denationalize America and destroy our immemorial friendships with other peoples, it insistently strives to strengthen the nationalism of Britain and our allegiance to her.

There is great merit in the desire for better understanding between America and Great Britain. But better understanding can never be promoted through attempts to debase our school histories into shameful defamation of America and undue exaltation of Britain.

It is upon the true character of our nation and people that all our international accords have rested and must continue to rest. The traditional American spirit derived out of our true history has not only given us peace,

progress and prestige, but has been and is the strongest influence for peace and progress throughout the world.

We have had our true history through many generations. Adults of today, our fathers, grandfathers, and great grandfathers absorbed its virile spirit. It never has made us a warring people. On the contrary, America has been exceptionally at peace.

"It is to the glory of the United States," even Lloyd George has said, "that she never has engaged in a war except in defense of liberty."

What is taught to our children in the schools directs our national spirit and aspirations and determines our nation's destiny.

The record left us by the fathers has ever been our nation's best chart and compass. The star that our fathers followed to our nation's birth has been the unfailing guide in our glorious development and destinies as a people.

Nothing so solidifies, strengthens and inspirits a people as an unsullied history—the grand pageant of their principles, heroisms, triumphs, ideals and purposes. Unless we preserve in pride the high aims and momentous achievements of our fathers, how may we hope for right inspirations in our children? The nation that is not secure in its past can have no faith in its future.

